2003

Collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at liberal arts institutions

Jessica Lynn Moon
University of Northern Iowa

COLLABORATION BETWEEN STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AT LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS

An Abstract of a Thesis

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

Jessica Lynn Moon

University of Northern Iowa

August 2003

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of senior student affairs administrators and academic affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their respective divisions. Through a survey adapted for this study, senior administrators at liberal arts institutions were asked to report their perceptions and opinions on the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs at their institution. They were also asked their perceptions of the need for collaborative relationships, the benefits of partnerships, occurrences of collaboration, and the perceived barriers to collaboration at their institutions. Seven scale composites were created to allow for a clear comparison of administrative responses on the main themes of each research question. Furthermore, institutional and personal characteristics affecting the likelihood to support and promote collaborative activity were examined.

It was found that position (senior academic affairs administrator or senior student affairs administrator) had a significant effect on differences in perception regarding the importance of collaboration, benefits resulting from collaboration, influences to collaborate, and barriers to collaboration. There were no significant differences in questions addressing administrative relationships, level of interaction, and level of cooperation taking place on campuses. Lack of statistical significance indicated similarities in administrative values and opinions in these areas. Such similarities make liberal arts institutions ripe for increased collaborative activity. Several implications and suggestions for further research are presented for professionals in the field of higher education.

COLLABORATION BETWEEN STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AT LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS

A Thesis

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

Jessica Lynn Moon

University of Northern Iowa

August 2003

This Study by: Jessica Lynn Moon

Entitled: Collaboration Between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs at Liberal Arts Institutions

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the

Degree of Master of Arts in Education

6-30-03
Date — Dr. Carolyn Bair, Chair Thesis Committee

6-30-03
Date — Dr. John Henning, Thesis Committee Member

6.30.03
Date — Dr. Michael Waggoner, Thesis Committee Member

7-22-03
Date — Dr. John W. Somervill, Dean, Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge several individuals who were instrumental in the completion of this thesis. First, my thanks to Dr. Bridgette O'Brien Pregliasco who kindly gave permission to adapt her survey for the purposes of this study. I also want to express my great appreciation to the members my thesis committee for their efforts throughout the development of this work. The guidance of Dr. Carolyn Bair, Dr. John Henning, and Dr. Michael Waggoner was an integral part in the completion of this project. Finally, I wish to thank Dr. Julia Wallace for her assistance on the statistical portion of the study, as well as her overall encouragement throughout the process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

General Background

Collaboration between the divisions of student affairs and academic affairs in institutions of higher education is a concept discussed extensively in the student affairs field (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Schroeder, 1999; Stringer, Steckler, & Johnson, 1989). Collaboration is promoted as a way of bringing faculty members and professional staff together to work in meaningful, productive ways for the benefit of students. Partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs help students make meaning of diverse college experiences. Such partnerships may enhance students' abilities to draw connections between diverse course materials and the out-of-class experiences they encounter on a daily basis. Furthermore, uniting members of the two divisions to work jointly on appropriate projects is a way to bolster the effectiveness of both groups, similar to the concept that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs also contributes to a seamless learning environment that emphasizes efficiency and effectiveness rather than delineation of functions and specialties. This kind of holistic approach to education is one in which individual components of the academic experience are drawn together to create a more complete outcome (Kuh, 1996). This concept has become increasingly important to educators as students are reporting difficulty making connections between the courses they take, as well as a lack of understanding as to how academics relate to real world experiences (Knefelkamp, 1991).

Those who work in higher education know how often the structural split between academic affairs and student affairs impacts the success of the work of both divisions. Both faculty and professional staff are all too aware of differences in philosophies that can exist between the two. The split between academic affairs and student affairs can be traced to the historic governance structure of American higher education. In the earliest days of American collegiate life, faculty were responsible for monitoring all facets of the student experience. As professional staff began taking responsibility for the support of students outside the classroom, most faculty limited their interaction with students to strictly the academic realm. This early delineation of roles created a difference in professional philosophies that continues to the present time (Knefelkamp, 1991).

Regardless of differences in perspectives, the foremost concern of members of both divisions is the creation of an environment that increases the academic growth and success of students. The belief that working together toward that end will improve the student learning experience is why collaboration between divisions has been promoted in the student affairs literature for the last several years. The improved educational environment created when faculty and staff join forces and combine expertise is the driving force behind the call to collaborate.

Recent research has focused on the value of providing a holistic learning environment for students (Knefelkamp, 1991; Kuh, 1996; Schroeder, 1999). For example, connecting classroom experiences with residence hall learning opportunities and identifying growth opportunities in informal social events can improve the overall learning experience of college students. Each interaction that takes place on the college

campus, both in and outside the classroom, is an opportunity to enrich the educational lives of students. Furthermore, research has indicated the value that collaborative programs provide for students. Improved rates of retention, higher grade point averages, and increased intellectual activity are just a few of the benefits students are experiencing with participation in programs where academic faculty and student support staff collaborate (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Schroeder, Minor, & Tarkow, 1999).

Need for the Study

A critical question must be asked of faculty and student affairs professionals: How can educators expect students to have a truly holistic, seamless learning experience if a chasm exists between academic affairs and student affairs? While the separation between the two divisions is longstanding and rooted in a historical context, the current literature supports the value of collaboration for the overall learning experience of students. There is a need to seriously reexamine the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs on college campuses. One way to do this is to study the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of key administrators responsible for the two areas.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of senior student affairs administrators and senior academic affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their respective divisions. Collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs is often dependent on the level of support and encouragement that comes from senior officers and administrators who must both support and model collaboration in order for practitioners and faculty to follow suit. Previous

researchers have addressed this issue in two-year, comprehensive, and doctoral institutions (Kolins, 1999; Pregliasco, 1994); this study adds to the existing body of research literature by focusing on senior administrators in liberal arts institutions.

Through a survey adapted for this study (see Appendix B), senior administrators at liberal arts colleges and universities were asked to report their perceptions and opinions on the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs at their institution. They were also asked their perceptions of the need for collaborative relationships, the benefits of partnerships, occurrences of collaboration, and the perceived barriers to collaboration at their institutions. Furthermore, institutional and personal characteristics affecting the likelihood to support and promote collaborative activity were examined. These characteristics included institutional size, governance, religious affiliation, and reporting structure, as well as personal characteristics of gender and length of time in their current position.

Definition of Terms

Division: For the purposes of this study, the term "division" refers to an administrative unit in higher education. The description of academic affairs and student affairs as divisions refers to the two branches or units found in higher education's traditional administrative structure.

Student Affairs: This term refers to the administrative division in higher education that provides for student needs in areas including, but not limited to, admissions, residence life, financial aid, advising, career planning, and student health.

"At some institutions, the unit has also been referred to as student development, student life, student personnel or student services" (Pregliasco, 1994, p. 5).

Academic Affairs: This term refers to the administrative division in higher education that oversees all academic and educational requirements of the institution. Academic programs, course planning, and student intellectual development are concerns of the academic affairs division. In addition, this unit is responsible for determining faculty responsibilities, course loads, and issues related to tenure of faculty.

Senior Student Affairs Administrator (SSAA): This term refers to the person in charge of the division of student affairs at an institution. The senior administrator's title may range from vice president or vice chancellor of student affairs to dean of students.

Senior Academic Affairs Administrator (SAAA): This term refers to the person in charge of the division of academic affairs at an institution. Examples of titles for senior academic administrators might include vice president or vice chancellor of academic affairs, provost, or dean of faculty.

Collaboration: The term "collaboration" is used extensively in this study. Loparco defines collaboration by saying,

> Collaboration is sometimes used interchangeably with words like dialogue, cooperation, consultation, coordination, partnership, and team work. However, collaboration goes beyond many of these terms. It incorporates dialogue – an exchange of ideas and opinions. Collaboration takes the sharing of ideas and opinions into a problem-solving process in which decisions are made and recommendations are implemented. (Loparco, 1991, p.16)

Research Questions

The following research questions provide an underlying basis for this study.

1. How does position (senior student affairs or academic affairs administrator) influence responses regarding:

    a. collaborative relationships and the level of interaction with divisional counterparts?

    b. the importance of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    c. the occurrences of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

    d. the benefits of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    e. the influences on administrators to encourage collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    f. the barriers to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

2. What is the impact of institutional and personal characteristics of the administrator on responses to questions pertaining to:

    a. collaborative relationships and the level of interaction with divisional counterparts?

    b. the importance of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    c. the occurrences of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

    d. the benefits of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    e. the influences on administrators to encourage collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    f. the barriers to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

Overview of Methodology

The sample for this study consisted of senior student affairs and senior academic affairs administrators from 191 of the 228 institutions defined by the 2000 Carnegie Classification as Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts. The top-ranking student affairs and academic affairs administrators from each institution were identified through institutional websites and contacted by e-mail to complete a web-based survey regarding collaboration.

The survey instrument used in this study was adapted, with permission, from a survey developed by Bridgette O'Brien Pregliasco for her dissertation study (Pregliasco, 1994). It contains six sections of forced-choice questions that address issues such as the relationship between senior administrators, the importance and level of interaction between divisions at their institution, and the benefits of, influences on, and barriers to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their college or university. Whereas Pregliasco studied Comprehensive and Doctoral I institutions, liberal arts institutions were selected for this study in order to investigate collaboration at a type of institution not covered by most recent research literature. Expanding research to liberal arts institutions was included in Pregliasco's suggestions for future research.

An e-mail was sent to each member of the sample population describing the study and requesting their participation. The message contained a link to a website hosting a web-based electronic survey with instructions on how to complete and submit the survey. When surveys were submitted, data were housed in a university server until collection was completed. At that time, data were automatically entered into categories created for

SPSS analysis. Mean responses were figured for each individual question, and the mean responses of academic and student affairs administrators were compared using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). For section six of the survey, multiple regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between institutional and administrative demographic characteristics and the questions from sections one through five.

Parameters of the Study

This study was completed using survey research methodology. Survey research is *ex post facto*, meaning the study investigates something that has already taken place. Results depend on the ability of the respondents to recall events, practices, or behaviors from the past, which is a limitation of the survey research method (Wiersma, 2000).

Data were collected electronically, and electronic collection has the potential to affect response rate. While some researchers have concluded that electronic surveys generate the same or better response rates than mail surveys, other studies have shown the opposite. In a 2002 study on electronic surveys the response rate was significantly lower for electronic surveys than for mail surveys, though the response time proved to be much faster (Shannon & Bradshaw, 2002).

In the study from which the survey was adapted, data were collected with a paper and pencil survey from Comprehensive and Doctoral I institutions as defined by the 1994 Carnegie Classifications. This study was limited to Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts institutions as defined by the 2000 Carnegie Classifications (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2001). Additionally, this study sought

responses from senior administrators and did not cover faculty, staff, or student opinions regarding collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In recent years student affairs literature has included a substantial number of articles on issues related to collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs. The following section will summarize recent research and writing on six main issues that are related to the development of collaborative relationships. First, the role of student affairs professionals will be examined to present a clear description of the profession's history as well as the current status of the student affairs profession. This will be followed by a discussion of the historical split between the divisions of student affairs and academic affairs. Next, the concept of seamless learning and its relationship to collaboration will be examined. The rise of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs, as well as examples of current collaborative programs on college campuses will be discussed. Finally, results of collaborative programs and recent research on collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs will be summarized.

Role of Student Affairs

When contemplating teaming student and academic affairs, it is important to be able to accurately define the role of student services professionals to faculty who are often unclear about the purpose of the student affairs division. The student affairs profession has gone through many changes over the course of its existence. From a history of being considered merely service providers to the profession's current

overarching desire to affect all aspects of student development, student affairs professionals themselves have at times struggled to define their role. Kathleen Manning, author of "Contemplating the Myths of Student Affairs," summed up the current role of the student affairs profession by saying "if once 'founded by default,' we currently exist because of need and demand" (1996, p. 40).

The first formal attempt to define the student affairs profession took place in 1937. Nineteen members of the American Council on Education contributed to a piece entitled the *Student Personnel Point of View (SPPV;* American Council on Education, 1937). The *SPPV* viewed "students holistically, believing in the potential of all students, and relying on rich experiences, both in and out of classrooms" (Roberts, 1998, p. 19). Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito commented on the first *SPPV* by saying it "was a reminder to the higher education community that in addition to the contributions of research and scholarship, the personal and professional development of students was (and remains) a worthy and noble goal" (1998, p. 6). The early work accomplished by the *SPPV* in defining a holistic view of education is in keeping with Komives and Woodard's request to readers,

> As you consider the history of student affairs, please note two enduring and distinctive components. The first is the profession's consistent and persistent emphasis on and commitment to the development of the whole person. In spite of the dramatic changes that have occurred in higher education, the profession's adherence to this fundamental principle should not be overlooked or underestimated. (2003, p. 65)

A revised edition of the *SPPV* was published in 1949 to include aspects of productivity and efficiency, such as increased specialization of roles, which was logical considering the country's tenor immediately following World War II. However, this

change of direction to compartmentalization and specialization of duties undermined the holistic focus of the 1937 edition and caused a fracture between practitioners and faculty (Roberts, 1998). Knefelkamp said specialization "has led to an increased separateness between faculty and student affairs and an increased separateness from students" (1991, p. 6).

The next major leap in the role of student affairs took place during the unrest of the 1960s. Professionals turned to models of student development in order to effect positive change on the college population. "While students tried to change the world, social scientists—primarily from psychology and sociology—had already begun to theorize about how students change and grow in college" (Evans et al., 1998, p. 7). The creation and use of student development theories during this time is another indication of the profession's longstanding commitment to the whole student. However, the student development trend was not rooted in the educational missions of institutions, so the movement failed to succeed to the degree professionals had hoped. Additionally, the movement failed to gain the respect of faculty for the field of student affairs, which professionals hoped would be a bi-product of successfully steering institutions in the direction of student development (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1996).

The Student Learning Imperative (SLI) published by the American College Personnel Association in 1994 served to remind educators that the role of student affairs professionals should be rooted in the academic mission of each educational institution. The piece acknowledged "the dual goals of personal development and learning as being at the heart of higher education's mission" (Bloland et al., 1996, p. 220). Bliming and

Alschuler also commented on the strong emphasis the piece placed on student learning goals,

> The importance of student affairs and academic affairs concentrating their combined efforts on student learning is emphasized in the *SLI*. Among other issues, the *SLI* describes student learning as the primary mission of student affairs and, in so doing, reaffirms its traditional educational purpose. (1996, p.203)

The integrated approach set forth by *The Student Learning Imperative* directly addressed the split common on many campuses: faculty take responsibility for cognitive growth, while student services focus on psychosocial development. Unfortunately, this split leaves students responsible for creating a unified growth experience (Bliming & Alschuler, 1996; Laff, Schein, & Allen, 1987).

Student affairs professionals can do several things in an effort to increase the integration of cognitive and psychosocial learning experiences. Blimling and Alschuler set forth several techniques to focus the role of student affairs on the educational mission of the institution. Among these was the suggestion to "increase the intellectual content of student affairs activities" (Bliming & Alschuler, 1996, p. 212). Bloland et al. addressed this issue by saying,

> Student affairs is particularly equipped to collaborate with academic affairs to enhance learning outcomes that may include effective citizenship, democratic ideals and democracy; cognitive, interpersonal, and organizational skills; the development of a community and its maintenance; self-discipline, self-understanding, and responsibility for self and community; and the necessity for and the value of deferred gratification and hard work, honesty, and integrity. (1996, p. 219)

Brady agreed in her 1999 article in *Liberal Education*. She made note of many areas in which student affairs professionals hold expertise that can contribute to an institution's overall learning environment. These areas include facilitating small group discussions,

encouraging student-faculty contact, and understanding student diversity in terms of learning styles and cultural differences (Brady, 1999).

History of Student Affairs/Academic Affairs Split

There is a longstanding philosophical and operational division between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs that dates back to the establishment of the collegiate system in the United States. When institutions of higher education were originally founded in colonial times, they were built on the English model of residential education. Faculty lived in residence with students so learning could take place at all times, not just inside the classroom, and instructors provided for all the needs of students. Bliming and Alschuler described this original model of education by saying, "what we now separate into academic and student affairs were seamlessly integrated responsibilities of every person holding a position in colonial colleges" (1996, p. 204). During this time the focus of educators was on the holistic development of the entire student (Knefelkamp, 1991).

The late 1800s and early 1900s saw a shift to the German model of education in which faculty are solely responsible for teaching and research. It was during this time that institutions began hiring non-faculty employees to deal with "paternalistic/nurturing functions that were previously the responsibility of faculty" (Bloland et al., 1996, p. 218). The student affairs field was born and developed rapidly during the 1900s. By 1937 the first *Student Personnel Point of View* was published (American Council on Education, 1937). The need for student affairs professionals increased with national issues such as the G.I. Bill following World War II and the unrest on college campuses in the 1960s (Brady, 1999). By the 1970s the split between divisions was not only official, but firmly

in place. Faculty and professional staff had different goals and purposes and the specialization of their fields superceded the desire to work together for the greater good. Faculty concentrated on developing student intellect and student affairs professionals assumed duties on the periphery of academics. Therefore, faculty "came to regard student affairs functions as separate from the academic core of the institution" (Kuh, Shedd, & Whitt, 1987, p. 253). The resulting division in fields is what Lee Knefelkamp refers to as the "separatist structure" in higher education (1991, p. 3). While faculty and professional staff work in close proximity, there is a lack of understanding or commonality between the two. Knelfelkamp commented on this phenomenon by saying,

> How did academic affairs and student affairs, living side by side for years on the same campus, evolve into separate cultures, with so little knowledge of one another?...How could a group of educators, committed to the holistic development of students, create a system in American higher education that organizationally and psychologically resulted in separatism not only for faculty and student affairs personnel but also for students? (1991, p. 3)

Dickerson-Gifford (1990) examined values of subcultures within higher education and found that there are significant differences in the values of academic affairs and student affairs administrators consistent with the historical split between divisions. Student affairs professionals value "responding to the whole person, attending to individual difference, and working with the student at his/her developmental level," while academic administrators' commitment to their heritage "was reflected in the values of teaching, research, and service" (Dickerson-Gifford, 1990, p. 143). Dickerson-Gifford's work represents how influential historical viewpoints remain on today's college campuses.

The 1994 *Student Learning Imperative* garnered attention for centering student affairs work solidly within an institution's academic mission. At the same time, faculty and educational specialists began showing more and more concern about the current quality of higher education. The press had begun to question "the rapid rise in college costs; low retention and graduation rates; the primacy of research over teaching; inefficiency, duplication, and waste; greater gaps between ideal academic standards and actual student performance" (Schroeder, 1999, p. 6). Combining efforts of student affairs professionals with those of faculty became a potential solution to problems within institutions of higher education. As a result, some student services professionals think "student affairs may be in its best position yet, since its beginning, to reduce the dualism within the system of higher education and achieve a more richly shared role with academic affairs in defining and achieving positive and holistic learning for students" (Caple, 1996, p. 201).

Concept of Seamless Learning

The push for collaboration is rooted in the perceived value of holistic education, also referred to as "seamless learning." George Kuh describes the concept of seamless learning as one in which "separate, distinct parts...are now of one piece, bound together so as to appear whole or continuous" (1996, p. 136). Lee Knefelkamp describes seamlessness as "the notion that in class and out-of-class experience together produce growth" (1991, p. 6). Knefelkamp (1991) also emphasizes the importance of seamless learning in a time when college seniors report having difficulty finding links between courses in their major and the general education curriculum, as well as a lack of

understanding about the connection between their liberal arts education and the greater community in which they live. Additionally, the obvious separation between educational divisions on campus tends to confuse students who attend college with expectations of being part of a tight-knit community (Ryan, 1989). In an attempt to offset this trend toward educational confusion, the seamless concept promotes unifying curricular and extracurricular experiences to create holistic learning (Bloland et al., 1996).

Richard Caple (1996) makes mention of the *Student Learning Imperative's* push to remove the typical conflicts between curricular and extracurricular components of education and to have student affairs professionals work more closely with faculty. In fact, he claims "concepts like 'curricular' and 'extracurricular' are being replaced with ones like 'seamless'" (Caple, 1996, p. 193).

Seamless learning environments can be established on campuses in many practical ways. One example is the use of orientation to the institution, one of a student's first experiences within the college environment. Much discussion has taken place over where orientation should be housed. Is it an academic undertaking or a responsibility of the student affairs division? Greenlaw, Anliker, and Barker (1997) addressed this issue in their survey of 137 universities, with 95 institutions responding. Sixty-six percent placed the responsibility in the hands of student affairs professionals, 16% placed it in academic affairs, 6% saw it as a shared responsibility, and 12% placed orientation in another division (Greenlaw et al., 1997). Eight institutions in the study were considering moving orientation from student affairs into the realm of academic affairs. This move was likely a result of concerns about academic stringency reported throughout external

constituencies. However, shifting responsibility from student affairs to academic affairs is also seen as a possible cause of "less emphasis on the holistic development of students" (Greenlaw et al., 1997, p. 306). The most reasonable solution appears to be collaboration between faculty and staff so that aspects of both academic and social importance are addressed in a student's orientation to college.

Seamless education can occur in many other ways. Knefelkamp (1991) recommended several areas in which combining academics and student services can result in powerful learning experiences. These include working together on issues of multiculturalism and diversity. Faculty work on these issues in the curriculum and professionals address them in practice, but the two groups do not often link together in a meaningful way. In addition, experiential learning and service learning are areas that are ripe for partnerships. Student affairs staff have expertise in theory-to-practice issues that can be helpful in experiential learning curricula (Knefelkamp, 1991).

In "Guiding Principles for Creating Seamless Learning Environments for Undergraduates," Kuh outlined six ideas to aid in the creation of a seamless learning institution (1996). Among these is the need for one or more leaders to create a sense of enthusiasm for the changes and improvements that are possible on the campus. This is critical because it is unlikely that seamlessness will simply occur by itself. Kuh also outlined the need for creating a "common vision of learning" to provide all involved with a shared understanding of the educational values of the institution (1996, p. 138). Finally, he suggested opening dialogue between academics and student affairs as well as

collaborating on projects that will support the common vision of learning previously defined by members of the institution (Kuh, 1996).

The creation of seamless learning environments through partnerships of academic and student affairs professionals is important because of the resulting benefits to the student. Among the reported benefits are "improved student satisfaction, academic achievement, persistence, and graduation rates and gains in general education outcomes. Effective partnerships also enhance students' cognitive and psychosocial development and foster their academic and social integration" (Schroeder, 1999, p. 12). Additionally, students have increased interaction with faculty, and "substantially higher levels of overall student learning" (Schroeder, 1999, p. 12).

Rise of Collaboration and Examples of Programs

Making meaning of a variety of experiences and drawing connections among diverse course materials is not likely for students who lack the benefit of educators willing to contribute to collaborative ventures. Seamless learning environments are developed when both faculty and student affairs professionals are committed to working together to implement them. Susan Brady contributed a piece to *Liberal Education* that spoke of collaboration by saying,

> One of the best ways to make student learning come alive on campuses is to improve the collaboration between student and academic affairs staff. These collaborations need to go beyond relating out of class activities to the curriculum. They need to be true, substantive partnerships, across administrative lines, which serve to implement the goals of liberal education. (1999, p. 14)

Educational researchers understand the value of collaboration and have begun to produce work that calls for more cooperation among divisions "to enhance the quality of

campus life" (Hyman, 1995, p. 3). Both the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), two national student affairs associations, have published suggestions on developing collaborative relationships. The two organizations also teamed with the American Association for Higher Education in 1998 to publish *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning*, an article that directly addresses issues of collaboration at the college level (Kellogg, 1999). Authors of the report introduced the piece by saying, "this report makes the case that only when everyone on campus—particularly academic affairs and student affairs staff—shares the responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress in improving it" (AAHE, ACPA, & NAPSA, 1998, p. 1). The report offered ten principles of learning, highlighted by best practice examples of collaboration as well as suggestions for action directed toward faculty and staff (AAHE, et al., 1998).

There are many examples of collaborative projects happening on college campuses across the country. Banta and Kuh (1998) discussed instances where faculty and staff collaborate on assessment projects. Faculty have considerable expertise in their disciplines, and student affairs specialists are able to complement disciplinary knowledge with their own experience in assessing and interpreting students' needs (Banta & Kuh, 1998). Banta and Kuh cited examples of collaborative assessment in programs such as Virginia Commonwealth University's study of the first year experience. First year students turned in weekly written responses to questions regarding their experiences. English faculty and student affairs professionals teamed to read the responses and

categorize results, providing information that eventually impacted the development of the institution's strategic plan (Banta & Kuh, 1998).

At Wake Forest, officials began administering the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) in 1995. The assessment revealed that Wake Forest students were spending less time engaging their friends in conversations about topics of significance than students at comparison institutions. In response, the college began intentionally relating campus activities to classroom topics in an effort to increase intellectual discourse on campus. Additionally, faculty began teaching in the residence halls in order "to make student living environments more intellectually engaging" (Banta & Kuh, 1998, p. 43). Since then, student affairs professionals have used the results of the CSEQ to provide the faculty with greater understanding of the characteristics of their student body. The questionnaire has also prompted increased contact between divisions and conversations about how to make "out-of-class experiences more compatible and complementary with curricular goals" (Banta & Kuh, 1998, p. 43).

As mentioned earlier, orientation is an area where collaboration between academic and student affairs can be very beneficial. Hearing from representatives of both academic and student affairs, students are given a full view of their campus community and are able to understand the expectations of the entire institution (Greenlaw et al., 1997). Many institutions are taking orientation a step further by developing extended first year experience programs to provide new students with more advising and support for a positive transition to college. The New Student Experience (NSE) at Kennesaw State College is an example of such a program. NSE includes orientation, extended

advising, and a first year seminar. There is collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs divisions in each of the three components of the New Student Experience. In particular, the Associate Dean for Student Affairs jointly leads the seminar with a faculty coordinator. Those who teach the course receive training to increase their understanding of student development and improve their mentoring and teaching skills. As a result, "it is not uncommon for a faculty member to remark...that his or her evaluations in discipline-based courses improved as a result of teaching the freshman seminar course" (King, 1993, p. 46).

A similar program called Freshman Interest Groups (FIG) takes place at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The program was developed in an attempt to prove the institution's commitment to high quality education to their external constituencies. Residential learning communities were designed in hopes they would improve academic achievement and retention, create a small campus feel for first year students, and incorporate a seamless learning environment of curricular and co-curricular activities (Schroeder et al., 1999). FIGs consisted of small groups of students who took three classes together and lived in the same residence hall. A team of faculty, students, and student affairs staff completed planning for this project. The team was compiled of people from various departments who "supported the project's objectives and had the authority to make decisions, commit resources, and affect change in their areas" (Schroeder et al., 1999, p. 39). Implementing FIGs on campus opened the door for a successful collaborative project at University of Missouri-Columbia.

Seattle University took a unique approach to collaboration when they decided to work towards "bridging the student life and academic *cultures*" (Stringer et al., 1989, p. 46). In an effort to do this, institutional members determined the overriding ideals that were shared by representatives from both academic and student affairs. These ideals were translated into two visual models; one represented the current state of separate cultures and the other showed the optimum model of bridged cultures. Several collaborative programs grew out of the process of defining a model of collaboration, including the Seattle University Outdoor Experience that was used for new student orientation, and a Student Life Staff Retreat that focused on the potential for developing further collaborative experiences at their campus (Stringer et al., 1989).

Edmund Ryan (1989), the executive vice president of academic affairs at Canisius College, contributed an article to the *NASPA Journal* that included several suggestions for collaboration not currently found on many college campuses. He believes student affairs professionals should routinely contribute to discussions on curriculum and be allowed to affect faculty development through sharing knowledge of student characteristics and development. Ryan (1989) suggests the addition of student affairs presence on curriculum committees to ensure the appropriate level of attention is given to issues in their areas of expertise, such as experiential learning. Similarly, he encourages student affairs professionals to support student intellectual development by attending faculty seminars on campus and including discussion of the intellectual environment in staff meetings and planning sessions. He suggests teaming with faculty, who are trained in disciplinary research, to clarify the best systems of educational development for

students. Ryan's overriding point is "all of us must be concerned with every facet of student development" (1989, p. 75).

A special 1989 edition of the *NASPA Journal* highlighted several articles regarding collaboration. The guest editor of the issue, Suzanne Brown, pointed out that despite challenges and barriers, collaboration is happening on our campuses to varying degrees (1989). The above are but a few representations of the ways colleges and universities have implemented collaborative programs on their campuses over the past several years.

Results of Collaboration

Developing faculty and staff partnerships would not be worth the time and effort involved if it did not result in a tangible benefit. Beyond making sense, what does recent research reveal about collaborative efforts and their effect on student learning and development? The following section summarizes the outcomes of collaborative projects at various collegiate institutions.

Collaboration in assessment programs at Virginia Military Institute (VMI) helped faculty and staff identify the type of students at greater risk for dropping out. As a result of these collaborative efforts, the orientation program at VMI was adapted and extended to better prepare students for their college experience. Because of collaboration and the resulting changes at VMI the rate of attrition has decreased at this institution (Banta & Kuh, 1998).

The Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs) program at University of Missouri-Columbia was discussed in the previous section. Designing FIGs was a major

collaborative undertaking for this university and it ended up paying off in many ways. Four methods of evaluation were used to determine the success of the program, including polling students to determine their satisfaction, longitudinal research on academic achievement and retention, surveys of first-year students, and surveys of the parents of participating students. Interesting results were gathered from each type of evaluation. Student satisfaction surveys showed that 85% would recommend FIGs to a friend, and 6% more would recommend the program if a few improvements were made. Parents also indicated a positive perception of the program based on their student's reaction and description of their experience (Schroeder et al., 1999).

The longitudinal study of student records and formal student surveys gave some of the most informative results of the evaluation process. After examining the records of students who were involved, it was determined that those involved in FIGs had higher retention rates than those who did not participate. Ninety-six percent of the FIGs students returned for second semester compared to 91% of non-FIGs students. One-year retention rates were 87% for FIGs compared to 81% for non-participants. FIGs students were also shown to have higher grade points, "even when controlling for differences in entering ability" (Schroeder et al., 1999, p. 45).

The MU Freshman Survey, an instrument developed on site, was given to University of Missouri-Columbia students during the fall semester. The survey showed FIGs students had "significantly higher levels of academic integration and institutional commitment" than non-FIGs students (Schroeder et al., 1999, p. 45). Meanwhile, the College Student Experiences Questionnaire was administered during the spring semester

and showed FIGs students were more involved in activities than those not in the program. Both tests reported FIGs students had more interaction with peers and informal communications with faculty members than non-FIGs participants. Perhaps the most telling result of the evaluation process was that both surveys also indicated FIGs students showed "significantly greater gains in communication skills and general education than did other students" (Schroeder et al., 1999, p. 45). These are encouraging results for educators who are committed to the implementation of collaborative programs.

Indiana University Bloomington used the University of Missouri-Columbia as a model when designing Freshman Interest Groups for their campus. This was not their first experience implementing a program to promote seamless education. They had success with similar programs in the past and had institutional support for adding a first year experience course in an effort to improve retention and increase their graduation rate (Westfall, 1999). Beyond their retention figures, Westfall points out unintended consequences of collaboration that have been a positive addition at Indiana University Bloomington. First, the peer instructor preparation program developed for the FIGs was so successful it is now being used to help train graduate instructors and teaching assistants. The second unexpected result was the development of positive cross-campus relationships to benefit faculty and staff, not just improve the student experience. As Westfall says, the participants discovered "the gulf between the various offices and departments on campus is not as great as we might believe" (1999, p. 59).

The previous examples of collaborative programs represent the positive results that can come from cooperative endeavors. Increased retention, higher levels of

integration and commitment, and improved faculty-staff relationships were just some of the positive outcomes of collaboration discovered by these institutions (Banta & Kuh, 1998, Schroeder et al., 1999, Westfall, 1999).

Research on Collaboration

Opinion pieces on the benefits of collaboration abound, but few researchers have offered definitive evidence of its value or have studied the perceptions administrators and practitioners have about its place in the university. That said, a review of current literature did reveal some research regarding collaboration, and this section summarizes the work most relevant to this study.

Zauyah Abdullah's 1998 dissertation study presented qualitative evidence for the benefits of collaborative work. Abdullah partnered with a faculty member to teach a first year course and then studied the reactions of both the students and instructors. Using qualitative methods such as interviews, observations of classes, and analysis of student writing samples, Abdullah was able to get a clear picture of the opinions and perspectives of those participating in a collaborative endeavor. Statements from the faculty member indicated that working collaboratively helped "in the areas of improved teaching styles, teaching techniques, knowledge of students and the awareness of campus facilities and services" (Abdullah, 1998, p. 206). Meanwhile, students indicated greater understanding of "campus orientation, organizational skills, study skills, and various other aspects of learning and personal development" (Abdullah, 1998, p. 206).

In 1994, Anne Blackhurst asked whether student learning is affected in a substantially different way by a collaborative team of faculty and staff rather than one or

the other. One hundred-eighty students participated in a first year experience course and were randomly assigned to 9 sections, 3 taught by faculty, 3 by a student affairs professional, and 3 by a combined team of both. Looking specifically at academic achievement and psychosocial development, the study revealed that students found student affairs professionals addressed both cognitive and affective goals to a greater degree than faculty members (Blackhurst, 1994). The author made the assumption that the assessment tool measured students' general satisfaction with their instructor when rating the degree to which they emphasized goals. As a result, Blackhurst deduced that students were more satisfied with the courses taught by student affairs professionals. However, the professional background of their instructor did not dramatically affect student outcomes. Because of this Blackhurst said,

> ...utilizing teaching teams of faculty and student affairs professionals in order to maximize the achievement of course outcomes does not appear to be warranted. However, utilizing such teams may result in greater student satisfaction with the freshman orientation course than utilizing faculty members only. (1994, p. 171)

Blackhurst (1994) concluded by stating that further research needs to be done before determining that there is no relationship between the professional background of the instructor and student outcomes in first year programs. She is one of many researchers to state that further study needs to be completed in order to understand the purpose and value of working collaboratively for the benefit of students.

Senior administrators provide an interesting sample in studies of the concept of partnership across divisions. One predictor of a collaborative environment is validation of collaboration "from the top" (Kolins, 1999, p. 163). Strong leadership is essential for successful partnerships to occur. Senior officers "who stand solidly for collaboration,

stimulate it through professional development opportunities, recognize and reward it, and even model it themselves, provide powerful support for collaboration" (Banta & Kuh, 1998, p. 44). Therefore, it is important to understand the perceptions and opinions of senior administrators in order to plan and implement programs with a collaborative component.

A sample of 32 senior student affairs officers from public and private institutions were asked nine open-ended questions regarding their level of collaboration in the area of student development (Reger & Hyman, 1989). A definition of student development was provided so each respondent had a similar understanding of the context in which the questions were asked. Two of the questions sought to specifically address the issue of whether student services professionals are perceived to be educators or administrators in their own eyes and in the eyes of faculty members. The senior officers responding indicated that high-ranking positions were primarily administrative, while entry and middle level staff were primarily seen as educators. When asked whether they believe faculty would label staff as educators, the overwhelming majority of senior officers indicated that faculty perceive student affairs professionals to be administrators rather than educators. They think this perception is directly rooted in the historical separation between divisions as well as the service-oriented emphasis of some departments. However, "respondents reported that the greater the interaction between student affairs and faculty, the greater the likelihood of student affairs staff being perceived as educators" (Reger & Hyman, 1989, p. 67). While these qualitative responses cannot be generalized to every educational population, they certainly shed light on the opinions of

many senior student affairs administrators regarding the dynamics between divisions that may affect a collaborative venture.

When examining the support for student development goals at liberal arts institutions, chief academic officers (CAOs) and chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) agreed on the general importance of student development. However, there was statistical significance in the difference of opinion regarding individual subgoals (Chandler, 1996). For instance, "CAOs rated academic development and intellectual development as being statistically more important than did CSAOs. Personal development, ethical/moral orientation, and interpersonal skills were rated statistically more important by CSAOs" (Chandler, 1996, p. 86). It is important to note that certain demographics impacted the level of importance placed on developmental subgoals. Institutional size, type, and classification had the most consistent effect on the responses of senior administrators with respondents from "smaller, private, church-related Baccalaureate II institutions perceiving the goals of student development as being more important" (Chandler, 1996, p. 106). Senior student affairs administrators at small, private colleges should take advantage of the opportunity to partner with academic administrators sympathetic to student development goals (Chandler, 1996).

Senior administrators at comprehensive institutions also expressed both similarities and differences when addressing student development subgoals. When setting the opinions of presidents and vice presidents of academic affairs, student affairs, and finance along side each other, the greatest levels of disagreement occurred between academic and student affairs officers. While vice presidents of academics and student

services expressed differing goals, presidents often expressed opinions similar to those of student services administrators (Kelley, 1987). This type of agreement on major goals "may imply a closer alliance with the Presidents than many Student Affairs Vice Presidents perceive exists" (Kelley, 1987, p. 141).

Collaboration is an important issue at community colleges as well as four-year institutions. Four hundred forty-four senior officers from 327 community colleges responded to a survey that studied perceptions of collaboration at the two-year college. Responses shed light on administrative attitudes regarding the frequency, level, and importance of collaboration at their institutions, as well as their satisfaction with collaborations already taking place (Kolins, 1999). Administrators in both divisions identified examples of types of collaborative practices happening in their institutions, including academic advising, orientation, and professional development programs. Out of 23 examples provided on Kolins' survey, administrators disagreed on the utilization of only 3 of the practices. Additionally, senior student affairs administrators indicated that collaborative practices positively impacted students to a greater degree than academic affairs administrators, while the academic administrators showed greater satisfaction with current collaborative practices than those in student affairs (Kolins, 1999).

Several personal characteristics of administrators played a role in the level of importance attributed to collaboration. Gender was one of those characteristics. Female senior student affairs administrators "rated collaboration as more important to student success than did all other administrators" (Kolins, 1999, p. 139). In contrast, male senior academic affairs administrators "rated collaboration as least important to enhancing

student success" (Kolins, 1999, p. 139). Another interesting characteristic identified as impacting the level of importance given to collaboration is that of previous experience as an educator. An administrator who formally served as a faculty member was more likely to rate collaboration as important to student success, regardless of the administrative division in which the professional currently served (Kolins, 1999).

Kolins made general conclusions about collaboration at two-year institutions after completing his study. First and foremost, the study indicated that administrative perceptions about collaboration and its importance to students are "generally positive" (Kolins, 1999, p. 172). Additionally, the perceptions of academic and student affairs administrators appear to be more similar at two-year colleges than at four-year institutions when compared to the results from Pregliasco's study of Comprehensive I and Doctoral universities (Kolins, 1999).

Administrators at comprehensive and doctoral institutions have much to say about their perceptions of collaboration and their feelings regarding the collaborative activities taking place at their institutions. In a study of student affairs and academic affairs senior administrators at comprehensive and doctoral universities, 318 respondents shared their opinions on collaboration (Pregliasco, 1994). A survey was used to glean information on how administrators perceive the relationship between units, the importance of collaboration in certain areas, the benefits of collaboration, sources of influence to collaborate, and barriers to collaboration. Seven scales were created to measure responses and report findings.

For the scales "relation" and "interaction," results indicated that both types of administrators were positive about the relationship with their counterparts and reported interacting with each other approximately once a month. Academic administrators reported meeting more frequently than the faculty and staff who work under their leadership (Pregliasco, 1994).

The "importance" of collaborating was determined to be of moderate value to both academic and student affairs officers. Examples of activities or functions in which faculty and staff could collaborate were provided. While administrators generally agreed on the importance of collaborating, student affairs administrators showed higher mean scores for each suggested activity. They showed significantly higher levels of perceived importance for "career planning, student programs on AIDS and diversity, faculty development, and student affairs development" (Pregliasco, 1994, p. 69).

When considering the "benefits" of collaboration, administrators indicated that "an improved overall campus climate and enhanced educational experience for students" were two of the more consequential benefits (Pregliasco, 1994, p. 70). Perceived "influence" to collaborate seems to come first from the administrators themselves. Academic administrators were further influenced by their student affairs counterparts and then by the institution's president. Student affairs administrators were further influenced by the president, the student affairs staff, and then by their academic affairs counterpart (Pregliasco, 1994).

While "barriers" to collaboration were determined to be minimal, "specific barriers such as organizational culture, resource limitations, and beliefs of the faculty

received significantly higher ratings from CSAAs than CAAAs" (Pregliasco, 1994, p. 70). Meanwhile, overall "cooperation" levels were ranked between minimal and advisory with the highest levels of cooperation being reported by both types of administrators for functions such as "recruiting, academic advising, and outcomes assessment" (Pregliasco, 1994, p. 71).

Finally, institutional characteristics and personal characteristics of the administrators were analyzed to determine their relationship to the individual scales. The student affairs culture and level of bureaucracy were institutional predictors for five of the seven scales. Gender was a significant personal characteristic for the relation, benefit, and barrier scales "indicating that women perceived greater benefits and barriers to cooperation but viewed the relationship less positively" (Pregliasco, 1994, p. 72).

Kolins and Pregliasco completed studies that addressed the issue of perceptions and practices of senior administrators at two-year, comprehensive, and doctoral institutions. Their results indicate that institution type has an impact on opinions regarding collaboration (Kolins, 1999; Pregliasco, 1994). Both authors suggested continuing this vein of research by exploring perceptions and practices of administrators at liberal arts institutions.

The previously described studies represent the research efforts being made in the area of collaboration. Researchers have explored how partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs impact students (Abdullah, 1998; Blackhurst, 1994). Others have shown commitment to understanding the influences and alliances at work in academia, especially in comprehensive institutions (Kelley, 1987). Such issues make a

significant impact on collaborative partnerships between divisions, and research efforts need to be expanded to fully understand influences at work in all types of institutions. While researchers have studied administrators at liberal arts colleges in terms of student affairs goals and student development (Chandler, 1996; Reger & Hyman, 1989), there is a gap in understanding of perceptions, attitudes, and practices of liberal arts administrators specifically regarding collaboration. This study was performed to fill that gap in the research.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of senior student affairs administrators and senior academic affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their divisions. The success of collaboration is often dependent on the level of support and encouragement that comes from senior officers. Administrators must not only support, but also model collaboration in order for practitioners and faculty to follow suit. In a survey adapted for this study, senior administrators at liberal arts colleges were asked to report their perceptions on the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs at their institution. They were also asked their perceptions of the need for collaboration, the occurrences of collaboration on their campus, benefits of partnerships between divisions, and the perceived barriers to collaboration at their institution. Furthermore, institutional and personal characteristics affecting an individual's likelihood to support and promote collaborative activity were examined.

Research Design

This study was completed using survey methodology, one of the "most widely used research types in educational research" (Wiersma, 2000, p. 157). Educational research is rooted in the principle of empiricism and emphasizes a systematic approach to collecting information. It is additionally characterized by the principles of validity and reliability. Validity encompasses both internal and external validity, the degree to which

results can be interpreted correctly and "the extent to which research results can be generalized" (Wiersma, 2000, p. 6). Reliability relates to "the replicability and consistency of the methods, condition, and results" of the study (Wiersma, 2000, p. 9).

While there are a variety of research methods that can be employed when undertaking a research study, each method is generally categorized as either qualitative or quantitative. Survey research methodology, the type used in this study, falls within the category of quantitative research. Quantitative research uses numbers, rather than words, as descriptors and is rooted in the positivist paradigm that promotes the value of the scientific process. The focus in quantitative research is on the belief that science and the scientific method play very positive roles in the pursuit of successful and meaningful research (Wiersma, 2000).

Survey research is *ex post facto*, meaning the study investigates something that has already taken place. Results depend on the ability of the respondents to recall events, practices, or behaviors from the past, which is a limitation of the survey research method (Wiersma, 2000). However, the mean responses submitted by the sample of senior student affairs and academic affairs administrators used in the study, when paired with inferential statistics, will provide a representative view of the attitudes and perceptions of the larger administrative population.

Sample

The sample population for this study was chosen from senior student affairs administrators and senior academic affairs administrators at liberal arts colleges. Two top-ranking administrators, one from each division, were selected from 191 of the 228

institutions defined by the 2000 Carnegie Classification as Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts. The Carnegie Foundation defines Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts as institutions with a major emphasis on undergraduate programs that award at least half of their degrees in a liberal arts field (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2001). This definition was provided by the 2000 edition of *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education,* a system widely used for categorizing American colleges and universities (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2001). The first Carnegie Classification was published in 1973. It has been edited several times over the years, with the most recent publication in 2001.

A total of 191 of the 228 Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts institutions were included in the sample. Institutions were eliminated from the sample for several reasons including the inability to obtain the appropriate contact information, affiliation with institutions no longer operating since the 2000 Classification, or the request from an administrator to not be included in the study.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study was adapted, with permission, from a survey developed by Bridgette O'Brien Pregliasco (1994) for her dissertation study. It contained forced-choice questions developed by Pregliasco after her review of literature and her interviews with senior administrators. While Pregliasco's survey contained seven sections, the survey used for this study contained only six sections. The section omitted from Pregliasco's original instrument focuses on bureaucracy and institutional goals. That section was particularly suited to Pregliasco's comparison of responses from both

comprehensive and doctoral institutions. The current study examined only liberal arts institutions, making the comparison of bureaucratic and institutional goals from two types of institutions unnecessary. Consequently, the section related to bureaucratic and institutional goals was removed from the survey.

The first set of questions in the survey instrument addressed perceptions of the relationship between senior student affairs and academic affairs administrators. The section included questions regarding their level of agreement on issues of shared purpose, mutual understanding, and positive working relationships. The section also asked about the frequency of interaction between the administrators, as well as the amount of interaction they perceive is happening between faculty and staff.

Section two examined administrative opinions about the importance of interacting and the level of interaction taking place between the two divisions. A number of administrative and academic functions were listed such as academic advising, career planning, recruiting, and developing new academic programs. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of collaborating for each function and also rate their institution's level of collaboration regarding that function.

Section three addressed the benefits of collaboration by asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with various statements describing potential positive results of cooperative activities. The fourth section dealt with the influences on administrators to collaborate. Respondents were asked to rate how much encouragement they have received from various constituencies such as students, the president, or external agencies.

The fifth section addressed barriers to collaboration. Respondents were asked to rate the degree to which certain institutional factors such as resource limitation or organizational culture dissuades cooperation. Finally, the instrument concluded with demographic questions about the institution and the administrator. Respondents were asked to provide information such as institutional size and reporting structure as well as personal characteristics such as gender and professional background. These questions were used to determine if demographic characteristics were predictors of responses to questions in the previous five sections.

Pre-Test of Survey

Pregliasco ran a pre-test on the original survey and found no need for major revisions. Therefore, a pre-test on the survey adapted for this study was performed primarily to test the technology used for the web-based application. The pre-test was performed by sending the survey electronically to three pairs of senior student affairs and academic affairs administrators not included in the sample population. The administrators were sent an e-mail asking them to access the survey website, complete the survey, and submit their results. Additionally, they were asked to respond by e-mail to describe any problems they encountered or suggestions they wanted to share. Responses were utilized to clarify the survey instructions and adjust the way the survey transitioned from one page to the next.

Procedures

The sample population was identified from the 2000 Carnegie Classification of Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of

Teaching, 2001). Carnegie Classification was used because it is a widely-used and highly-regarded system for the classification of college and universities in the United States. Additionally, Pregliasco used the 1994 Carnegie Classification to identify her sample for the project on which this study is based. In order to maintain consistency between the studies to allow for comparison of results, the Carnegie Classification was employed. While Pregliasco studied Comprehensive and Doctoral I institutions, this study focused on Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts. Liberal arts institutions were selected in order to investigate collaboration at a type of institution not covered by most recent research literature. Expanding research to liberal arts institutions was included as one of Pregliasco's suggestions for future research.

The 2000 Carnegie Classification listed 228 institutions as Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2001). Two administrators, one from the academic affairs division and one from the student affairs division, were selected from 191 of those institutions. The survey was completed using an electronic, web-based format. Institutional websites were searched in order to identify upper-level administrators and to secure their e-mail addresses for later contact. In some cases, websites did not include a listing of institutional administrators so contact was made through webmasters or toll-free numbers for admissions offices to determine which individuals should be included in the sample.

A web-based version of the survey was created with the help of an Instructional Technology (IT) specialist who used *Soupermail*, a program to write web surveys. Two versions of the survey were created, one for academic affairs administrators and one for

student affairs administrators. Likewise, two lists of e-mail addresses were given to the IT specialist. This allowed two sets of e-mails to be directed to the appropriate individuals, each with a heading that corresponded to their administrative position. The IT specialist wrote a program to assign a random identifier to each e-mail as it was sent. This random identifier attached itself to the web address provided in the e-mail. When participants accessed the survey website to complete and submit the form, the identifier was submitted along with their responses. This identifier was only used to determine who had not submitted the survey after two weeks so automated e-mail reminders could be sent. The code was not used to identify anyone or associate their institution with their responses.

An e-mail message was sent to each member of the sample population. The e-mail described the study and requested their participation. The message contained a link to a website hosting a web-based electronic survey with instructions on how to complete and submit the survey. When respondents submitted the survey, the data were transmitted to an iscssun server located in the researcher's office. The server stored the information until a sufficient response rate was achieved. At that time, data were transferred from the iscssun server to a program designed for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for data analysis (SPSS Inc., 2002). An analysis of descriptive data was conducted on the first five sections of the survey to determine mean responses of senior student affairs and senior academic affairs officers on individual survey items. Composite scales were created by

figuring the means of clusters of similar questions grouped together in subsections of the survey. Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability coefficient for these scales (Cronbach, 1951).

The mean responses of senior academic affairs administrators and senior student affairs administrators were compared using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The ANOVA is used to test a null hypothesis that "two or more population means are equal" (Wiersma, 2000, p. 356). This one-way test revealed any statistically significant differences between mean responses of academic affairs and student affairs administrators on individual questions as well as the scale composites. Finally, multiple regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between institutional and administrative demographic characteristics and the scales for sections one through five.

Section one included questions regarding level of agreement on issues of shared purpose, mutual understanding, and positive working relationships. Means were figured separately for academic and student affairs administrative responses. Similarly, means were figured for responses to questions in this section regarding frequency of interaction between the administrators, as well as the amount of interaction they perceived between faculty and staff members.

Means were figured for responses to questions in section two regarding administrative opinions about the importance of interacting and the level of interaction taking place between the two divisions. In section three, means were figured for questions that focused on the benefits of collaboration by asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with various statements describing potential positive results of

cooperative activities. Mean responses in the fourth section were figured to give insight into the influences on administrators to collaborate and in the fifth section the means were figured for questions that addressed barriers to collaboration.

When means were tabulated for questions in sections one through five, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also performed for each scale using administrative position as the independent variable. This was performed to determine if there were statistically significant differences in responses given by academic affairs administrators as opposed to student affairs administrators.

The final portion of data analysis used demographic data collected in section six of the survey. Respondents provided information such as institutional size and reporting structure as well as personal characteristics such as gender and professional background. These questions were used to determine if demographic characteristics were predictors of responses to questions in the previous five sections. Stepwise multiple regression was implemented using both institutional characteristics and personal characteristics of administrators as predictor variables for the analysis. This analysis was used to determine which institutional and personal characteristics had an effect on responses to scale items. Variables determined to have a statistically significant impact on responses were highlighted while those that were not statistically significant were removed from the analysis.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of senior student affairs administrators and senior academic affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their respective divisions. Previous researchers have addressed this issue in two-year, comprehensive, and doctoral institutions; this study adds to that body of research literature by focusing on senior administrators in liberal arts institutions. This chapter will summarize the results of the study's survey regarding collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs

Electronic surveys were distributed to 382 senior student affairs and academic affairs administrators at 191 liberal arts colleges. Responses were obtained from 94 academic administrators and 101 student affairs administrators for a total response rate of 195 or 51%. The data collected in the surveys were analyzed to answer the research questions laid out at the beginning of the study. Those research questions were:

1. How does position (senior student affairs administrator or senior academic affairs administrator) influence responses regarding:

    a. collaborative relationships and the level of interaction with divisional counterparts?

    b. the importance of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

    c. the occurrences of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

    d. the benefits of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

e. the influences on administrators to encourage collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

f. the barriers to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

2. What is the impact of institutional and personal characteristics of the administrator on responses to questions pertaining to:

a. collaborative relationships and the level of interaction with divisional counterparts?

b. the importance of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

c. the occurrences of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

d. the benefits of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

e. the influences on administrators to encourage collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

f. the barriers to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

Demographic Summary

The demographic characteristics of the survey's respondents are summarized in Table 1. Administrative position was split somewhat equally with senior student affairs administrators responding to a slightly higher degree. An institution size of 1001 to 2000 was most common, with 59.5% of the respondents choosing that category. Institutions were overwhelmingly under private control with 43.1% having an affiliation with a religious organization. Administrators reported the most common length of time in their

positions to be 1 to 4 years, followed closely by the 5 to 10 year category. The split between genders was 61.5% male to 36.4% female, with 2.1% not reporting on that item.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Respondents for Position, Size of Institution, Public/Private Control, Religious Affiliation, Years of Experience, and Gender

Variable	Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
	Position		
SAAA[1]		94	48.2
SSAA[2]		101	51.8
		195	100
	Size of Institution		
Up to 500		11	5.6
501 to 1000		34	17.4
1001 to 2000		116	59.5
2001 or more		33	16.9
Unreported		1	0.5
		195	100
	Public/Private Control		
Private		164	84.1
Public		27	13.8
Unreported		4	2.1
		195	100
	Religious Affiliation		
No		106	54.4
Yes		84	43.1
Unreported		5	2.6
		195	100
	Years of Experience		
Less than a year		23	11.8
1 to 4 years		69	35.4
5 to 10 years		63	32.3
More than 10 years		38	19.5
Unreported		2	1.0
		195	100
	Gender		
Female		71	36.4
Male		120	61.5
Unreported		4	2.1
		195	100

[1] SAAA = Senior Academic Affairs Administrator

[2] SSAA = Senior Student Affairs Administrator

Scale Reliability

The mean responses to groups of questions from major sections of the survey were combined to create seven scale composites. These composites allow for a clear comparison of administrative responses on the main themes of each research question. Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each of the scales to determine the reliability coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). These coefficients indicate the degree of internal consistency present among survey items.

Reliability coefficients for the scales ranged from .6603 to .8783. McMillan and Schumacher (1993) state that reliabilities should generally be above .70 to be considered trustworthy. Four of the seven coefficients for this study were above .80, with two additional coefficients above .77. Only one scale, INTERACTION, had a coefficient below .70. However, the resulting coefficient of .6603 is satisfactory since "studies of groups can tolerate a lower reliability, sometimes as low as .50 in exploratory research" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993, p. 249). Given the nature of this study, the reliability coefficients for the scales are well within an acceptable range. Table 2 lists the coefficients for the seven scales.

Data Analysis

The analysis of data outlined in Chapter 3 will be described in detail throughout the rest of this chapter. When means were tabulated for questions in sections one through five, the two groups' mean responses were compared using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with administrative position as the independent variable. This one-way test revealed any statistically significant differences between mean responses of academic

Table 2

Reliability of Scales Used as Dependent Variable

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Relation	.8565
Interaction	.6603
Importance	.8783
Cooperation	.8738
Benefit	.8463
Influence	.7946
Barrier	.7751

affairs and student affairs administrators on individual questions as well as the scale composites.

> Research Question 1a: How does position (SAAA or SSAA) influence responses regarding collaborative relationships and the level of interaction with divisional counterparts?

Table 3 shows results for the RELATION scale and the questions that examined level of agreement on statements claiming shared institutional purpose, mutual understanding of roles, and positive working relationships between administrators. The possible responses for this section were strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree. Mean responses for the scale were 3.56 for SAAAs and 3.40 for SSAAs, indicating both academic and student affairs administrators agreed or strongly agreed on the three items that made up the RELATION scale. There was no statistically significant difference in responses for this scale. Since statistical significance would have represented disagreement on the items comprising the scale, the responses signify that the

administrators in the sample experience a high level of satisfaction in their working relationships with their administrative counterparts.

Table 3

Summary Table for Relation Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
RELATION	3.56 (.499)	3.40 (.549)	1.03
Shared purpose	3.51 (.600)	3.48 (.612)	.087
Mutual understanding	3.55 (.563)	3.41 (.670)	2.25
Positive work relationship	3.65 (.543)	3.56 (.577)	1.13

Table 4 shows mean responses for the INTERACTION scale, including questions regarding the frequency with which administrators meet to discuss issues of mutual concern, how often academic affairs is involved in student affairs programming, and how often student affairs is involved in academic affairs programs. The possible responses for this section were never, once a term, once a month, or once a week. Both types of senior administrators reported meeting between once a month and once a week; the mean responses for how often administrators meet to discuss issues of mutual concern were

2.44 for SAAAs and 2.43 for SSAAs. Meanwhile, both types of administrators reported that they perceive faculty and staff at their institutions interact between once a term and once a month. The similarity in administrative responses resulted in no statistically significant differences for this scale.

Table 4

Summary Table for Interaction Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
INTERACTION	1.89 (.656)	1.85 (.618)	.260
Meet to discuss issues	2.44 (.697)	2.43 (.673)	.000
AA involved in SA program	1.77 (.910)	1.69 (.917)	.396
SA involved in AA program	1.49 (.839)	1.38 (.900)	.708

Research Question 1b: How does position (SAAA or SSAA) influence responses regarding the importance of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

The survey addressed Question 1b with items that asked administrative opinions regarding the importance of interaction between divisions in a variety of functional areas. These areas included academic advising, career planning, recruitment, outcomes

assessment, registration, course scheduling, development of academic programs, retention, student programming, student spirituality, admissions policies, institutional effectiveness, research on students, faculty development, and staff development. Respondents were asked to rate each function using responses of high importance, medium importance, low importance, no importance, or don't know. The difference between SAAAs and SSAAs in means for this scale, IMPORTANCE, was found to be statistically significant. The composite mean of SAAA's responses was 1.93, while the mean for SSAAs was 2.11. Individual items with significant variance in means were career planning, programs for students concerning social issues such as AIDS, alcohol/drug abuse, or diversity, dealing with issues of student spirituality, admissions policies, and staff development. In all cases SSAAs attached a higher level of importance to these items than did the SAAAs. The IMPORTANCE scale and its individual questions are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Summary Table for Importance Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

	Mean		
Scale and items	SAAA	SSAA	F
IMPORTANCE	1.93 (.551)	2.11 (.460)	5.18*
Academic advising	2.22 (.895)	2.36 (.807)	1.34
Career planning	2.19 (.756)	2.49 (.674)	8.29*

(table continues)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
Recruiting new students	2.30 (.861)	2.47 (.735)	2.03
Outcomes assessment	2.40 (.790)	2.51 (.676)	.969
Registration	1.85 (1.05)	1.99 (.835)	1.06
Course scheduling	1.47 (1.04)	1.59 (.896)	.757
Develop academic programs	1.37 (.976)	1.59 (.833)	2.84
Retention	2.88 (.362)	2.88 (.409)	.002
Student programs - Ethics/leadership	2.36 (.720)	2.41 (.732)	.258
Student programs - Social issues	2.01 (.891)	2.26 (.747)	4.45*
Student spirituality	1.62 (.952)	1.89 (.819)	4.53*
Admissions policies	1.86 (1.03)	2.14 (.908)	4.07*
Instructional effectiveness	1.80 (1.07)	1.88 (.898)	.293
Research on students	2.19 (.773)	2.23 (.777)	.148
Faculty development	1.25 (1.04)	1.48 (.919)	2.82
Staff development	1.33 (1.06)	1.83 (.949)	11.75*

* $p<.05$

Research Question 1c: How does position (SAAA or SSAA) influence responses regarding the occurrences of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

While the IMPORTANCE scale summarized responses regarding how important administrators think cooperation is in a variety of functional areas, the COOPERATION scale summarized the level of interaction administrators perceive to be taking place between the divisions of student affairs and academic affairs within those functional areas. The difference in means for the COOPERATION scale was not found to be significant. However, individual items of instructional effectiveness and research on students were found to have statistically significant differences. In both cases, senior academic affairs administrators reported the perception of a higher level of cooperation occurring for those functional items than did senior student affairs administrators. Table 6 summarizes the means for the COOPERATION scale as well as the individual items that make it up.

Table 6

Summary Table for Cooperation Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

	Mean		
Scale and items	SAAA	SSAA	F
COOPERATION	1.63 (.519)	1.59 (.486)	.301
Academic advising	1.95 (.864)	1.98 (.824)	.078
Career planning	1.88 (.832)	1.95 (.792)	.348

(table continues)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
Recruiting new students	1.98 (.926)	2.01 (.840)	.062
Outcomes assessment	1.90 (.862)	1.95 (.962)	.138
Registration	1.73 (.968)	1.79 (.844)	.203
Course scheduling	1.23 (.915)	1.17 (.911)	.195
Develop academic programs	1.09 (.898)	1.01 (.768)	.413
Retention	2.53 (.584)	2.50 (.702)	.091
Student programs - Ethics/leadership	1.96 (.773)	1.77 (.797)	2.78
Student programs - Social issues	1.73 (.831)	1.60 (.791)	1.14
Student spirituality	1.37 (.893)	1.39 (.892)	.026
Admissions policies	1.72 (1.02)	1.71 (.963)	.000
Instructional effectiveness	1.40 (.962)	1.12 (.946)	4.19*
Research on students	1.94 (.853)	1.69 (.800)	4.50*
Faculty development	1.00 (.864)	.93 (.820)	.332
Staff development	.97 (.827)	1.16 (.833)	2.54

* $p<.05$

Research Question 1d: How does position (SAAA or SSAA) influence responses regarding the benefits of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs?

In this section means were figured for questions regarding the benefits of collaboration. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with various statements describing potential positive results of cooperative activities. Possible responses were strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or don't know. The BENEFIT scale was found to have a significant difference in means between senior academic affairs and student affairs administrators. See Table 7. Most responses to individual items were similar, with a range between agree to strongly agree. The exception to this pattern was the item regarding the potential benefit of cooperation in providing professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. The SAAA's mean for this item was 2.86, which indicates a response between disagree and agree. Meanwhile, SSAAs responded between agree and strongly agree on this item for a mean of 3.31. The difference in responses between academic affairs and student affairs administrators on this item proved to be statistically significant, which influenced the showing of overall significance for the composite scale.

Research Question 1e: How does position (SAAA or SSAA) influence responses regarding the influences on administrators to collaborate between student affairs and academic affairs?

Mean responses were figured to give insight into the influences on administrators to collaborate. Possible responses to rate the extent to which factors may influence collaboration were none, minimal, moderate, or strong. The scale for this section, INFLUENCE, was found to have a significant difference in mean responses. Individual

Table 7

Summary Table for Benefit Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
BENEFIT	3.42 (.489)	3.59 (.433)	5.82*
Economic use of resources	3.19 (.695)	3.36 (.736)	2.61
Quality programs	3.52 (.582)	3.57 (.655)	.299
Enhance educational experience	3.63 (.586)	3.72 (.607)	1.08
Professional development	2.86 (.683)	3.31 (.635)	21.3*
Improve collegiality	3.57 (.558)	3.68 (.601)	1.60
Improve campus climate	3.62 (.608)	3.74 (.524)	2.32

* $p<.05$

items of influence that proved significant were students, the student affairs staff, and the institution's governing board. In each case the student affairs administrators reported a higher level of influence to collaborate from those groups than did academic affairs administrators. Table 8 summarizes the results for the INFLUENCE scale and the individual items which make it up.

Table 8

Summary Table for Influence Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
INFLUENCE	1.59 (.588)	1.78 (.545)	4.75*
Personal beliefs	2.70 (.565)	2.79 (.409)	1.55
President	1.98 (.994)	2.04 (.898)	.203
SAAA or SSAA	2.10 (.920)	2.11 (.905)	.002
Faculty	1.29 (.838)	1.42 (.824)	1.20
Students	1.25 (.914)	1.58 (.966)	5.76*
Student affairs staff	1.80 (.875)	2.08 (.769)	5.71*
Governing board	.93 (.887)	1.21 (1.00)	4.07*
External agency	.84 (.942)	1.00 (.948)	1.38
Other	1.42 (1.51)	1.45 (1.44)	.004

* $p<.05$

> Research Question 1f: How does position (SAAA or SSAA) influence responses regarding the barriers to collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at their institutions?

The final portion of the first research question addressed barriers to collaboration. The survey presented numerous factors that may obstruct collaboration and respondents were asked to rate the degree to which those factors are barriers to cooperation at their institution. Possible responses were not a barrier, minimal barrier, moderate barrier, or strong barrier. The BARRIER composite scale showed a significant difference in means between .89 for senior academic affairs administrators and 1.12 for senior student affairs administrators. These means indicate that SAAAs found the factors to either be a minimal barrier or not a barrier at all. SSAAs found the factors to be between minimal and moderate. Individual items found to be significant were organizational culture, beliefs of academic affairs staff or faculty that inhibit a positive relationship, organizational policies and procedures, and reward structures. In each case, SSAAs ranked the items as more substantial barriers than did SAAAs. These results are summarized in Table 9.

> Research Question 2: What is the impact of institutional and personal characteristics of the administrator on responses to questions pertaining to issues a-f?

The final portion of data analysis used demographic data collected at the end of the survey. Respondents provided information on institutional size, governance, religious affiliation, and reporting structure as well as personal characteristics such as gender and length of time in their current position. These questions were used to determine if demographic characteristics were predictors of responses to Research Questions 1a-1f.

Table 9

Summary Table for Barrier Scale and Items (Means, Standard Deviations, and F Ratios)

Scale and items	Mean SAAA	Mean SSAA	F
BARRIER	.89 (.893)	1.12 (1.12)	9.02*
Resource limitations	1.22 (.936)	1.38 (1.01)	1.28
Organizational culture	1.49 (1.04)	1.83 (.995)	5.20*
Organizational structure	1.28 (.964)	1.29 (.931)	.001
Personalities of administrators	.70 (1.01)	.89 (.969)	1.86
Beliefs of student affairs	.70 (.874)	.73 (.763)	.084
Beliefs of academic affairs	1.14 (.909)	1.55 (.943)	9.56*
Size of institution	.13 (.425)	.21 (.556)	1.23
Organizational policies	.65 (.733)	.99 (.818)	9.06*
Reward structures	.78 (.849)	1.30 (1.01)	14.59*
Other	.67 (1.00)	.89 (1.17)	.188

* $p<.05$

Stepwise multiple regression was implemented using both institutional characteristics and personal characteristics of administrators as predictor variables for the analysis. This analysis was used to determine which institutional and personal characteristics had an effect on responses to scale items. Variables determined to have a statistically significant impact on responses were highlighted while those that were not statistically significant were removed from the analysis. Table 10 shows the results of the multiple regression analysis.

Table 10

Multiple Regression Summaries of Scales Regressed on Institutional and Personal Characteristics of Administrators

Model	Predictor Variable	Multiple R	Adjusted R Squared	BetaIn	F
Dependent Variable: INTERACTION					
1	Reporting structure	.233	.049	.233	10.055*
Dependent Variable: IMPORTANCE					
1	Gender	.174	.024	.174	4.871*
2	Religious affiliation	.234	.042	.157	4.483*
Dependent Variable: INFLUENCE					
1	Public/Private	.214	.040	.214	7.769*
Dependent Variable: BARRIER					
1	Reporting structure	.167	.022	-.167	4.963*

* $p<.05$

The table includes the four scales where regression equations were statistically significant. Three scales, RELATION, COOPERATION, and BENEFIT, are not included because none of the independent variables were found to have significance.

Reporting structure was found to explain 4.9% of the variance in the INTERACTION scale. Both gender and religious affiliation were identified as significant in the IMPORTANCE scale, with the two variables together accounting for 4.2% of the scale's variance. Public or private control was shown to account for 4% of the variance in the INFLUENCE scale. Finally, reporting structure was found to be significant in the BARRIER scale where it accounted for 2.2% of the variance.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of senior academic and student affairs administrators regarding collaboration between divisions. Several areas were examined including administrative relationships and interaction, perceived importance and level of collaboration taking place at institutions, perceived benefits and barriers of collaboration, and the various influences on administrators to collaborate. The analysis of data reported in Chapter 4 provided a guide for the following discussion of results and implications of the study.

Discussion of Results

Analysis of Variance

In order to address Questions 1a-1f, mean responses were figured for each individual survey item. Similarly, mean responses to groups of questions in the major sections of the survey were combined to create scale composites. These composites allow for a clear comparison of administrative responses on the main themes of each research question. One-way ANOVA was used to compare mean responses of senior academic affairs administrators (SAAA) to those of senior student affairs administrators (SSAA). This comparison of means revealed statistically significant differences in administrative opinions on the survey questions. The following is a summary of important findings that resulted from data analysis.

RELATION: Means for questions making up the composite scale RELATION showed no statistically significant differences. In fact, mean responses to items regarding shared purpose, mutual understanding, and positive working relationships between administrators were quite similar for both academic and student affairs respondents. The RELATION scale means were 3.56 for SAAAs and 3.40 for SSAAs. These means show respondents consistently agreed or strongly agreed that there is shared purpose, mutual understanding, and a positive working relationship between themselves and their administrative counterparts. Pregliasco (1994) found similar levels of satisfaction in her study of administrators at comprehensive and doctoral institutions. Mean responses for the RELATION scale in her study were 3.47 for academic affairs and 3.41 for student affairs. However, when comparing mean responses on individual items, administrators at liberal arts institutions consistently reported slightly higher levels of satisfaction than the administrators in Pregliasco's study. This high level of satisfaction with the relationship between administrative counterparts indicates a working environment conducive to partnerships and cooperation.

INTERACTION: The INTERACTION scale was not statistically significant. Once again, both types of administrators reported their levels of perceived interaction in similar ways. Means were almost identical (2.44 for SAAAs and 2.43 for SSAAs) on the item which asked how often administrators meet to discuss issues of mutual concern. The responses indicate both types of administrators perceive themselves meeting between once a month and once a week for this purpose.

Senior administrators also reported a similar level of perceived interaction between the faculty and professional staff at their institutions. Respondents perceived that faculty and professional staff interact between once a term and once a month, which is notably lower than the interaction levels of senior administrators. This decrease in interaction for individuals "in the trenches" was also found in Pregliasco's (1994) study of comprehensive and doctoral administrators. This difference in level of interaction could be due to faculty and staff perceptions of benefits and barriers which administrators reported on later in the survey. It could also be a result of less participation in a wide array of projects in which collaboration is appropriate, given the job-specific duties for which faculty and staff are normally hired.

IMPORTANCE: A significant difference was found in the composite means for the IMPORTANCE scale. Individual survey items with significant differences were the importance of collaboration in functional areas of career planning, student programming on social issues such as AIDS, drug/alcohol abuse, or diversity, student spirituality, admissions policies, and student affairs staff development. SSAAs reported higher levels of importance in each of these instances. The difference of opinion regarding level of importance in these areas is understandable when put in context of the historical split between student affairs and academic affairs. As was mentioned in Chapter 2, faculty have focused solely on educational issues since student affairs professionals were given responsibility for the development of the student outside the classroom (Bloland et al., 1996; Kuh et al., 1987). The survey items where administrators agreed about level of importance were related to academic values such as academic advising, outcomes

assessment, developing academic programs, and instructional effectiveness. Items with significant differences in reported importance were related to traditional student affairs values, understandably emphasized to a greater degree by student affairs administrators. These findings are supported by those of Chandler (1996) who studied support for student development goals at liberal arts institutions. She determined chief academic officers found academic and intellectual development to be more important than chief student affairs officers, while the student affairs administrators found interpersonal skills and personal development to be more important.

COOPERATION: No significant difference in means surfaced for the COOPERATION scale, though instructional effectiveness and research about student issues on campus were two individual items with differences that proved to be statistically significant. Unlike significant items in the last section, SAAAs ranked these two items higher than SSAAs. This suggests academic administrators perceive higher levels of cooperation are taking place for instructional effectiveness and research on student issues than student affairs administrators report perceiving. Bloland et al. (1996) and Brady (1999) make mention of the expertise of student affairs professionals in areas such as these and cite them as ideal opportunities for members of the profession to contribute to their institutions. Perhaps student affairs administrators ranked these items lower due to the perception that more could be done cooperatively in these areas and the expertise of student affairs professionals on such topics could be more thoroughly acknowledged.

It is interesting to note that both academic and student affairs administrators seem to agree, for the most part, on the amount of collaborative work happening on their campuses. For most functional areas administrators agreed on the level of cooperation perceived, regardless of how important they rated cooperation in that area. A number of functions were ranked between medium and high importance, but were identified as having minimal to advisory levels of cooperation. This indicates that administrators agree on the importance of collaboration in certain areas, but they are not encouraging faculty and staff to seek out projects or opportunities to put functional partnerships in place. It is important for administrators to recognize the amount they value collaboration in functional areas is not being translated to the amount of actual cooperative efforts in those same areas.

One exception to be noted is the issue of retention. Both types of administrators ranked the retention item 2.88 in level of importance, where 2 was deemed medium importance and 3 was high importance. In the COOPERATION scale, retention was identified between advisory and collaborative in terms of the perceived level of cooperation occurring at their institutions. Academic and student affairs means on the retention item, 2.53 and 2.50 respectively, were the highest for any item on this portion of the survey. These kinds of elevated rankings on both importance and cooperation indicate the high priority both groups of administrators place on retaining their institution's students. This finding is corroborated by the number of collaborative programs described in the literature that are created in response to institutional concerns with retention (Banta & Kuh, 1998, Schroeder et al., 1999, Westfall, 1999).

BENEFITS: The BENEFITS scale revealed a significant difference in means, though only one individual item proved to be significant. Both types of administrators agreed or strongly agreed that five out of six items were potential benefits of collaboration. The one exception was the item that asked administrators to rate their level of agreement or disagreement that collaboration provides professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. Senior academic affairs administrators responded with a 2.86 while senior student affairs administrators rated the item 3.31, making the difference in means statistically significant. It is possible that academic affairs administrators do not see collaborative activities as contributing to the professional development of their faculty in the traditional sense normally recognized by an academic institution. Academic administrators value "teaching, research, and service" for their faculty (Dickerson-Gifford, 1990, p. 143). This purely academic focus does not always align with collaborative functions. Meanwhile, student affairs administrators agreed or strongly agreed that collaborative projects provide development opportunities. Strong agreement with statements about improved collegiality, campus climate, and educational experiences may shed light on why student affairs administrators are positive about opportunities for professional development. The outcomes listed above are more in line with the type of development the student affairs field values in its professionals.

INFLUENCE: The INFLUENCE scale summarized mean responses on the extent to which administrators are influenced to collaborate by various individuals and groups. Three individual items with significant differences in means were the influence of students, the student affairs staff, and the governing board of the institution. In all three

cases, SSAAs reported a higher level of influence or encouragement to collaborate from these individuals. A higher level of influence on student affairs administrators from students and student affairs staff is a logical outcome due to the student-centered values of the profession (Dickerson-Gifford, 1990). The significant difference in the reported influence of institutional governing boards is harder to explain. The difference could possibly be a reflection of the degree to which the student affairs division has taken "the lead in any cooperative venture since faculty members were preoccupied with teaching, research, and publication demands" (Eickmann, 1989, p. 41). The student affairs division may therefore receive more of the governing board's questions or directives regarding collaboration than the academic affairs division.

It is interesting to note that the highest reported influences from both academic affairs and student affairs administrators were their own personal beliefs, with a 2.70 and 2.79 respectively. This rating translates to a moderate or strong indication of the influence of personal beliefs. The second highest influence was that of the respondent's academic or student affairs administrative counterpart. These results strongly support previously stated assertions that administrative opinions play an extremely important role in the success of collaborative activities (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Kolins, 1999).

Pregliasco (1994) asked comprehensive and doctoral administrators to rank their influences to collaborate, and found academic administrators were first influenced by the student affairs administrator and then the president. Student affairs administrators cited the president and student affairs staff as influences before mentioning academic affairs administrators. The pattern of influence reported by student affairs administrators at

comprehensive and doctoral institutions is quite different than at liberal arts institutions. This may indicate that senior student affairs administrators at liberal arts institutions experience a more mutually supportive relationship with their corresponding senior academic affairs administrator than those at larger institutions.

Responses to items that asked for ratings on the amount of influence wielded by faculty and student affairs staff members are worth discussing. It is not uncommon for student affairs professionals to think they bear the lion's share of responsibility for promoting collaboration. Student affairs literature is filled with suggestions for practitioners to take the initiative to seek out collaborative projects and develop relationships with faculty colleagues (AAHE et al., 1998; Brady, 1999; Schroeder & Hurst, 1996). The literature's emphasis on the role of student affairs professionals in initiating collaboration is supported by the SSAA's responses that rated faculty influence between minimal and moderate (1.42) while placing student affairs staff influence between moderate and strong (2.08). Interestingly, SAAAs seemed to agree that such a gap in efforts exists. Academic administrators rated faculty influence at 1.29 while they placed student affairs staff influence considerably higher at 1.80.

BARRIER: The BARRIER scale was made up by mean responses to items rated by administrators in terms of the degree to which the example is a barrier to cooperation between student affairs and academic affairs on their campuses. The mean composites were found to be significantly different. Four individual items were significantly different as well, including organizational culture (history and traditions), beliefs of academic affairs staff or faculty that inhibit a positive relationship, organizational policies

and procedures, and reward structures. In each of these cases, SSAAs ranked the item as a more considerable barrier than did SAAAs. In fact, regardless of significance, means of student affairs administrators were consistently higher for every item in the BARRIER section. This would suggest student affairs administrators are more apt to identify barriers to collaboration on their campuses. Perhaps this is due to their overall knowledge of the subject as a result of the focus the student affairs profession has placed on collaboration in recent years (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Schroeder, 1999).

However, administrators gave their highest rating in this category to the item regarding organizational culture. Those in both academic and student affairs seem to recognize the history and traditions of their institutions can create a minimal to moderate barrier to collaborative work between divisions. This finding is one more support to others who have reported on the steadfastness with which individuals hold onto the traditional roles of their discipline (Dickerson-Gifford, 1990; Knefelkamp, 1991). With this mindset, lack of collaboration in years past will lead to unwillingness to introduce cooperative endeavors in the future.

Multiple Regression

The final portion of data analysis addressed Question 2. Multiple regression was used to determine if institutional size, governance, religious affiliation, and reporting structure, as well as personal characteristics of gender and length of time in their current position, had an effect on the seven previously-discussed scale items. Variables determined to have a statistically significant impact on responses were highlighted while those that were not statistically significant were removed from the analysis.

Statistically significant influences were not found for the RELATION, COOPERATION, and BENEFIT scales. However, in the four following scales several of the variables accounted for a significant, albeit small, variance. The institution's reporting structure was defined by whether student affairs administrators report to academic affairs administrators. This variable was found to affect the variance in both the INTERACTION and BARRIER scales. Meanwhile, gender and religious affiliation were both identified as significant for the IMPORTANCE scale, and the variable of public or private control accounted for variance in the INFLUENCE scale.

Pregliasco (1994) found gender to be a significant variable for her relation, benefit, and barrier scales. She also reported that public or private control, religious affiliation, headcount enrollment, student affairs culture, and level of bureaucracy accounted for variance in several of her scales. Kolins (1999) used administrative characteristics to determine influence on responses to items in his study and also found gender to be one of the variables that played a role.

It is interesting to note that significant variables were not static across the studies. For example, gender appeared to play less of a role in accounting for variance in liberal arts institutions than in two-year, comprehensive or doctoral institutions. The assortment of variables that were found to be significant in these three studies represents the vast number of influences that shape administrative perceptions of collaboration. It is difficult to isolate individual factors that affect collaboration given the innumerable personal or institutional influences at play in the lives of senior administrators. It is likely that many diverse factors coalesce to influence administrative opinions on collaboration.

Implications for Educational Professionals

Collaboration has been identified as a vehicle for increased interaction between divisions and improved educational development for students. Several important implications regarding collaboration have come out of this study for educators who wish to pursue collaborative activities on their campuses.

First and foremost, this study revealed that liberal arts administrators often agree. Administrators reported high levels of agreement regarding characteristics of their administrative relationships, as well as the amount of interaction that is taking place between administrators of the two divisions. Senior administrators would benefit from an awareness of the overwhelmingly positive view that is held regarding administrative relationships. This finding may give those individuals the confidence to continue enhancing partnerships to make the most of what already appears to be a positive working relationship.

While administrators agree that they met between once a week and once a month to discuss issues of mutual concern, they both report much lower levels of perceived interaction among their faculty and staff. Pregliasco (1994) discovered the same results in her study of senior administrators at Comprehensive and Doctoral I institutions. This discrepancy in interaction levels should encourage academic and student affairs administrators to recognize how important their influence is on the collaboration that takes place between divisions. An institution's administration sets the tone for campus priorities and values (O'Brien, 1989). Administrators who seek more collaboration on their campuses would be well served to encourage interaction, spearhead collaborative

efforts, and charge committees with projects requiring input and consultation between divisions. Such intentional assignments will provide faculty and staff with the impetus to get involved with their educational partners.

Another opportunity for increased partnerships would be in identifying functional areas where there were high levels of agreement about the importance of collaboration. Respondents ranked cooperating on functions such as academic advising, recruiting, outcomes assessment and institutional effectiveness, retention, programs for students on ethics, leadership, or community service, and research about student issues on campus within the range of medium to high importance. Administrators would benefit by partnering in these functional areas in order to maximize the effectiveness of their efforts. Perhaps focusing collaborative efforts on these functional areas, and experiencing success along the way, would eventually lead to increased partnership on issues currently deemed to be less important to some respondents.

An important finding of this study was the difference between the values administrators expressed regarding some functional areas and the levels of cooperation reported to be taking place for the same functions. The value expressed often outweighed the action taking place. Given these results, administrators should realize they have the opportunity to translate values into action by supporting collaborative projects in a variety of functional areas where both administrators agree collaboration is valuable.

Another important point regarding values is the tendency of administrators to revert to the historically held values of their field. This became evident as academic affairs administrators agreed with student affairs administrators on the importance of

collaborating on functions such as academic advising, outcomes, assessment, developing academic programs, and instructional effectiveness. Meanwhile, functions that related to traditional student affairs values were rated as less important by academic affairs administrators. These results may be a good reminder for all administrators that the historical values of their profession continue to guide their contemporary convictions (Chandler, 1996). While this, in itself, is not a negative attribute, administrators may want to be aware of the opportunity to step beyond historic roles to view the student experience in a more holistic manner.

Given the positive viewpoint administrators held on the importance of collaborating in certain functional areas, why is the resulting collaboration reported as only minimal to advisory? This is an area in which barriers likely play a significant role. The study revealed that both academic affairs and student affairs administrators placed resource limitations, organizational culture, organizational structure, and beliefs of academic affairs in the category of minimal to moderate barriers to collaboration. Student affairs administrators additionally named reward structures as a minimal to moderate barrier. Identifying the barriers reported to be most significant is an important step. Administrators may want to begin addressing those barriers in an attempt to clear the way for the benefits of collaboration.

It was encouraging to find that administrators agreed on five of the six potential benefits listed in the survey. Economic use of resources, quality programs, enhanced educational experiences, improved collegiality, and improved campus climate are extremely positive benefits of any collegiate program. Senior academic and student

affairs administrators could profit by considering how an expanded commitment to collaborative activity would increase the likelihood that their campus is improved by one or more of those potential benefits.

Recommendations for Future Research

Collaboration is an oft-mentioned topic in student affairs literature (Banta & Kuh, 1998; Schroeder, 1999; Stringer, Steckler, & Johnson, 1989), but solid research on the subject is lacking in many areas. While this study added to the body of research on collaboration, there are numerous areas in which research could contribute to a better understanding of the possibilities that collaboration provides for colleges and universities. Recommendations for future research are described in this section.

Research is needed that focuses on faculty and staff perceptions of collaboration, as well as those of administrators, to determine the reasons why administrators perceive that limited interaction is taking place between faculty and staff. Such research would also be able to more fully explore the notion that administrative influence on academic faculty and student affairs professionals plays a major part in collaboration at any given institution. The perceptions of faculty and staff could be paired with responses of their administrators to determine similarities and differences.

It would be interesting to determine if the perception that the student affairs division initiates most collaboration holds true in practice. Further research should attempt to determine who is initiating and participating in collaborative work. It is possible that the academic affairs division is not being given enough credit for their cooperative efforts. In addition, it would be interesting to determine if a person's

academic background and specific field of study impacts their willingness to collaborate. Is a math professor more prone to collaboration than a biologist? Are social scientists more apt to work collaboratively than musicians? Future research could examine such questions.

While the literature asserts the value of collaboration on seamless learning, further research is still needed to determine the effect collaboration has on the overall student experience. Research should continue to address how seamless environments influence student outcomes and their overall satisfaction with their educational experiences. Just as important to determine is the effect collaborative projects have on the faculty and staff involved. Exploring the topic of collaboration from the viewpoint of those outside the administration is an important next step.

Conclusion

This study was designed to examine the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of senior academic affairs administrators and senior student affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their respective divisions. While previous researchers had addressed this issue in two-year, comprehensive, and doctoral institutions, this study focused on senior administrators in liberal arts institutions.

It was found that position (SAAA or SSAA) had a significant effect on differences in perception in many areas regarding collaboration; however, it was also determined that existing similarities in administrative values and opinions make liberal arts institutions a place that is ripe for increased collaborative activity. Positive working relationships, agreement on the importance of collaboration in certain functional areas,

the clear understanding of potential benefits and barriers, and similar influences to collaborate put liberal arts administrators in the position to champion collaborative activity among their faculty and staff. Such efforts will allow institutions to strive toward the development of educational environments that provide students with seamless, holistic learning.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Z. (1998). Collaborative work in action: Creating a learning environment in the class with out- of-class activities. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59,* 11A.

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), American College Personnel Association (ACPA), National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (1998). *Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning.* Washington, DC: Author.

American College Personnel Assocation (ACPA). (1994). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education (ACE). (1937). *The student personnel point of view.* (American Council on Education Studies Series 1, Vol. 1, No. 3). Washington, DC: Author.

Banta, T. W., & Kuh, G. D. (1998). A missing link in assessment: Collaboration between academic and student affairs professionals. *Change, 30*(2), 40-46.

Blackhurst, A. E. (1994). A comparison of student outcomes in freshman seminar courses taught by faculty and student affairs professionals (academic achievement). (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55,* 10A.

Blimling, G. S., & Alschuler, A. S. (1996). Creating a home for the spirit of learning: Contributions of student development educators. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 203-216.

Bloland, P. A., Stamatakos, L. C., & Rogers, R. R. (1996). Redirecting the role of student affairs to focus on student learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 217-226.

Brady, S. M. (1999). Students at the center of education: A collaborative effort. *Liberal Education, 85*(1), 14-16,18-21.

Brown, S. S. (1989). Approaches to collaboration between academic and student affairs: An overview. *NASPA Journal, 26*(1), 2-7.

Caple, R. B. (1996). The learning debate: A historical perspective. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 193-202.

Chandler, K. B. (1996). Importance and responsibility of student development goals among chief academic and chief student affairs officers (chief academic officers). (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57,* 11A.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16,* 297-334.

Dickerson-Gifford, D. (1990). A comparison of values of two subcultures within higher education: Academic administrators and student affairs administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52,* 03A.

Eickmann, P. E. (1989). A systematic approach to fostering an academic and student affairs interface. *NASPA Journal, 26*(1), 40-44.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenlaw, H. S., Anliker, M. E., & Barker, S. J. (1997). Orientation: A student affairs or academic affairs function? *NAPSA Journal, 34*(4), 303-313.

Hyman, R. E. (1995). Creating campus partnerships for student success. *College and University, 71*(2), 2-8.

Kelley, R. C. (1987). University administrator perceptions of student services needs related to institutional goals. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49,* 04A.

Kellogg, K. (1999). *Collaboration: Student affairs and academic affairs working together to promote student learning.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 940)

King, N. S. (1993). Partnerships and collaboration for new student success. *College Student Affairs Journal, 13*(1), 44-47.

Knefelkamp, L. L. (1991). *The seamless curriculum.* CIC Deans Institute: Is this good for our students? Washington, DC: Council for Independent Colleges. ED 356 720

Kolins, C. A. (1999). An appraisal of collaboration: Assessing perceptions of chief academic and student affairs officers at public two-year colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60,* 11A.

Komives, S. R., & Woodard, D. B. (2003). *Student services: A handbook for the profession*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D. (1996). Guiding principles for creating seamless learning environments for undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 135-148.

Kuh, G. D., Shedd, J. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1987). Student affairs and liberal education: Unrecognized (and unappreciated) common law partners. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*(3), 252-60.

Laff, N. S., Schein, H. K., & Allen, D. R. (1987). Teaching, advising, and student development: Finding the common ground. *NACADA Journal, 7*(1), 9-15.

Loparco, L. B. (1991). Collaboration between academic and student affairs at the multiversity level for the purpose of student involvement: A case study of Farmville University (academic affairs). (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52,* 02A.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. New York: Harper Collins.

Manning, K. (1996). Contemplating the myths of student affairs. *NASPA Journal, 34*(1), 36-46.

O'Brien, C. R. (1989). Student affairs and academic affairs: Partners in higher education. *NASPA Journal, 26*(4), 284-287.

Pregliasco, B. O. (1994). A study of the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs at doctorate granting and comprehensive I institutions. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55,* 07A.

Reger, M. P., & Hyman, R. E. (1989). Academic and student affairs: Perceptions on partnerships. *NASPA Journal, 26*(1), 64-70.

Roberts, D. C. (1998). Student learning was always supposed to be the core of our work—What Happened? *About Campus, 3*(3), 18-22.

Ryan, E. G. (1989). The whale and the elephant: A fable for our time. *NASPA Journal, 26*(1), 71-76.

Schroeder, C. C. (1999). Partnerships: An imperative for enhancing student learning and institutional effectiveness. *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 5-18.

Schroeder, C. C., & Hurst, J. C. (1996). Designing learning environments that integrate curricular and cocurricular experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 174-181.

Schroeder, C. C., Minor, F. D., & Tarkow, T. A. (1999). Freshman interest groups: Partnerships for promoting student success. *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 37-49.

Shannon, D. M., & Bradshaw, C. C. (2002). A comparison of response rate, response time, and costs of mail and electronic surveys. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 70,* 179-192.

SPSS Inc. (2002). *SPSS 11.0 Guide to Data Analysis.* SPSS Inc., Chicago: Author.

Stringer, J., Steckler, B. M., & Johnson, D. R. (1989). Collaborative approaches to student growth from the student life and academic sectors. *NASPA Journal, 26*(1), 45-53.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2001). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education.* Menlo Park, CA: Author.

Westfall, S. B. (1999). Partnerships to connect in- and out-of-class experiences. *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 51-61.

Wiersma, W. (2000). *Research methods in education: An introduction.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

APPENDIX A

ELECTRONIC COVER LETTERS

March 2003

Dear Senior Academic Affairs Administrator,

I am writing to invite you to participate in a study examining collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs at liberal arts colleges. The topic of collaboration is often discussed in professional literature, but there is a lack of solid research on administrative opinions on the topic. This study aims to compare the perceptions and attitudes of senior academic affairs administrators and student affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their respective divisions.

Your institution has been selected as part of a sample of over 200 institutions for my master's thesis research. Participation in this study is purely voluntary. Responses will be kept confidential. Individuals and their institutions will not be identified.

The link at the bottom of this page will direct you to a web-based survey that will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Use of Microsoft Internet Explorer is recommended. The survey is intended for senior academic affairs administrators. If this message was inadvertently sent to the wrong individual, please forward it to the most senior academic affairs administrator at your institution.

The program used to send this e-mail has automatically assigned a random numerical code to each participant. This code will be recorded when your completed survey is encrypted and electronically submitted. The code will only be used to determine who has not yet submitted their survey in order to allow for sending reminder e-mails with the purpose of obtaining a substantial enough response rate for the project. The code will not be used to link responses with participants or their institutions.

Your participation in this study is critical for the completion of my master's thesis and I would be very appreciative of a prompt response. If you have any questions about this project you can contact me by e-mail at jessica.moon@uni.edu or by phone at 319-266-3211. Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Jessica Moon
University of Northern Iowa

Please click here to access the web-based survey (use of Microsoft Internet Explorer is recommended):
http://www.uni.edu/cgi-bin/uniforms.cgi?SoupermailConf=/moonie/web/saaa/survey.con&uid=555

March 2003

Dear Senior Student Affairs Administrator,

I am writing to invite you to participate in a study examining collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs at liberal arts colleges. The topic of collaboration is often discussed in professional literature, but there is a lack of solid research on administrative opinions on the topic. This study aims to compare the perceptions and attitudes of senior student affairs administrators and academic affairs administrators regarding collaborative work between their respective divisions.

Your institution has been selected as part of a sample of over 200 institutions for my master's thesis research. Participation in this study is purely voluntary. Responses will be kept confidential. Individuals and their institutions will not be identified.

The link at the bottom of this page will direct you to a web-based survey that will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Use of Microsoft Internet Explorer is recommended. The survey is intended for senior student affairs administrators. If this message was inadvertently sent to the wrong individual, please forward it to the most senior student affairs administrator at your institution.

The program used to send this e-mail has automatically assigned a random numerical code to each participant. This code will be recorded when your completed survey is encrypted and electronically submitted. The code will only be used to determine who has not yet submitted their survey in order to allow for sending reminder e-mails with the purpose of obtaining a substantial enough response rate for the project. The code will not be used to link responses with participants or their institutions.

Your participation in this study is critical for the completion of my master's thesis and I would be very appreciative of a prompt response. If you have any questions about this project you can contact me by e-mail at jessica.moon@uni.edu or by phone at 319-266-3211. Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Jessica Moon
University of Northern Iowa

Please click here to access the web-based survey (use of Microsoft Internet Explorer is recommended):
http://www.uni.edu/cgi-bin/uniforms.cgi?SoupermailConf=/moonie/web/ssaa/survey.con&uid=555

APPENDIX B

SURVEYS

Academic Affairs and Student Affairs
Relationship Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your input will provide valuable insight into the relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Responses to all questions will be kept confidential and only group results will be recorded. Individual institutions will not be identified.

1. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs at your institution. Please circle the appropriate response using the following scale:

SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

	Level of Agreement			
There is a shared institutional purpose between the senior student affairs administrator (SSAA) and the senior academic affairs administrator (SAAA).	SD	D	A	SA
There is mutual understanding between the SAAA and the SSAA regarding each other's roles and purposes.	SD	D	A	SA
There is a positive working relationship between the SSAA and the SAAA.	SD	D	A	SA

2. Indicate the usual frequency with which the following activities take place at your institution.

	Frequency			
	Never	Once a term	Once a month	Once a week
The SAAA and the SSAA meet to discuss issues of mutual concern.	0	1	2	3
Academic affairs staff/faculty are involved in student affairs planning and/or programming.	0	1	2	3
Student affairs staff are involved in academic affairs planning and/or programming.	0	1	2	3

3. The following list contains functions or programs where cooperation between academic affairs and student affairs could occur. Rate all the functions listed in terms of the importance of cooperation and the level of cooperation as described below:

A. In column A indicate, in your opinion, how important cooperation between the two units is regarding each function or program using the following scale:

3=High importance
2=Medium importance
1=Low importance
0=No importance
9=Don't know

B. In column B indicate the level of cooperation you perceive is occurring between the two units at your institution for each function using the following scale:

3=Collaborative – significant involvement of both units
2=Advisory – one unit has primary responsibility but involves the other to some degree.
1=Minimal – primarily exchange of information, isolated interaction.
0=No cooperation
9=Don't know

Column A		Column B
____	Academic Advising	____
____	Career planning/counseling	____
____	Recruiting new students	____
____	Outcomes assessment/institutional effectiveness	____
____	Registration	____
____	Course scheduling	____
____	Developing new academic programs or courses	____
____	Retention of students	____
____	Programs for students concerning ethics, leadership, or community service	____
____	Programs for students on current social issues such as AIDS, alcohol/drug abuse, or diversity	____
____	Dealing with issues of student spirituality	____
____	Admissions policies	____
____	Instructional effectiveness	____
____	Research about student issues on the campus	____
____	Faculty development	____
____	Student affairs staff development	____

4. Please designate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about potential benefits of cooperation using the following scale:

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree Don't Know

Cooperation between academic affairs and student affairs:

Leads to more economical use of resources	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Improves the quality of programs or functions	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Enhances the educational experience of students	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Provides professional development opportunities for faculty and staff	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Enhances collegiality between units	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Contributes to an overall campus climate that is supportive of students, faculty, and staff.	SD	D	A	SA	DK

5. Rate the extent to which you have been influenced or encouraged to work cooperatively with student affairs by the following factors. Circle the number that corresponds to your response.

	Extent of Influence			
	None	Minimal	Moderate	Strong
Your own beliefs	0	1	2	3
Your president	0	1	2	3
Your SSAA	0	1	2	3
The faculty	0	1	2	3
The students	0	1	2	3
Student Affairs staff	0	1	2	3
The governing board of your institution	0	1	2	3
External agencies such as foundations, accrediting agencies, etc	0	1	2	3
Other (please list and rate):_____	0	1	2	3

6. Rate the degree to which the following factors serve as barriers to cooperation between student affairs and academic affairs on your campus. Circle the number that best reflects your opinion.

	Not a Barrier	Minimal Barrier	Moderate Barrier	Strong Barrier
Resource limitations	0	1	2	3
Organizational culture (history and traditions)	0	1	2	3
Organizational structure (reporting lines between units)	0	1	2	3
Personalities of the senior administrators for each area	0	1	2	3
Beliefs of student affairs staff that inhibit a positive relationship	0	1	2	3
Beliefs of academic affairs staff or faculty that inhibit a positive relationship	0	1	2	3
Size of the institution	0	1	2	3
Organizational policies and procedures	0	1	2	3
Reward structures	0	1	2	3
Other (please list and rate):_____	0	1	2	3

From the list above, what are the top two barriers at your institution?

1. _____ 2. _____

INSTITUTION AND ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

7. What was the Fall 2002 headcount enrollment of you institution?

Up to 500 ____
501 to 1000 ____
1001 to 2000 ____
2001 or more ____

8. Is your institution public or private?

Public ____
Private ____

9. Is your institution formally affiliated with a religious denomination?

Yes ____ If yes, which denomination? _____
No ____

10. Does the senior student affairs administrator report to the senior academic affairs administrator at your institution?

Yes ____
No ____

11. At my institution I am currently the:

Senior Academic Affairs Administrator ____
Senior Student Affairs Administrator ____

12. Was your most recent previous higher education position in student affairs or academic affairs?

Student Affairs ____
Academic Affairs ____
Other ____ (Please specify) _____

13. Have you ever held a full time professional position in student affairs?

Yes ____
No ____

14. How long have you been in your current position at this institution?

Less than a year ____
One to 4 years ____
5 to 10 years ____
More than 10 years ____

15. Please indicate your gender.

Female ____
Male ____

16. Is there anything else you would like to add or suggest regarding the relationship between academic affairs and student affairs?

Student Affairs and Academic Affairs
Relationship Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your input will provide valuable insight into the relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Responses to all questions will be kept confidential and only group results will be recorded. Individual institutions will not be identified.

1. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning the relationship between student affairs and academic affairs at your institution. Please circle the appropriate response using the following scale:

SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

	Level of Agreement			
There is a shared institutional purpose between the senior student affairs administrator (SSAA) and the senior academic affairs administrator (SAAA).	SD	D	A	SA
There is mutual understanding between the SAAA and the SSAA regarding each other's roles and purposes.	SD	D	A	SA
There is a positive working relationship between the SSAA and the SAAA.	SD	D	A	SA

2. Indicate the usual frequency with which the following activities take place at your institution.

	Frequency			
	Never	Once a term	Once a month	Once a week
The SAAA and the SSAA meet to discuss issues of mutual concern.	0	1	2	3
Academic affairs staff/faculty are involved in student affairs planning and/or programming.	0	1	2	3
Student affairs staff are involved in academic affairs planning and/or programming.	0	1	2	3

3. The following list contains functions or programs where cooperation between academic affairs and student affairs could occur. Rate all the functions listed in terms of the importance of cooperation and the level of cooperation as described below:

A. In column A indicate, in your opinion, how important cooperation between the two units is regarding each function or program using the following scale:

3=High importance
2=Medium importance
1=Low importance
0=No importance
9=Don't know

B. In column B indicate the level of cooperation you perceive is occurring between the two units at your institution for each function using the following scale:

3=Collaborative – significant involvement of both units
2=Advisory – one unit has primary responsibility but involves the other to some degree.
1=Minimal – primarily exchange of information, isolated interaction.
0=No cooperation
9=Don't know

Column A		Column B
____	Academic Advising	____
____	Career planning/counseling	____
____	Recruiting new students	____
____	Outcomes assessment/institutional effectiveness	____
____	Registration	____
____	Course scheduling	____
____	Developing new academic programs or courses	____
____	Retention of students	____
____	Programs for students concerning ethics, leadership, or community service	____
____	Programs for students on current social issues such as AIDS, alcohol/drug abuse, or diversity	____
____	Dealing with issues of student spirituality	____
____	Admissions policies	____
____	Instructional effectiveness	____
____	Research about student issues on the campus	____
____	Faculty development	____
____	Student affairs staff development	____

4. Please designate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about potential benefits of cooperation using the following scale:

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree Don't Know

Cooperation between academic affairs and student affairs:

Leads to more economical use of resources	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Improves the quality of programs or functions	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Enhances the educational experience of students	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Provides professional development opportunities for faculty and staff	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Enhances collegiality between units	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Contributes to an overall campus climate that is supportive of students, faculty, and staff.	SD	D	A	SA	DK

5. Rate the extent to which you have been influenced or encouraged to work cooperatively with student affairs by the following factors. Circle the number that corresponds to your response.

	Extent of Influence			
	None	Minimal	Moderate	Strong
Your own beliefs	0	1	2	3
Your president	0	1	2	3
Your SAAA	0	1	2	3
The faculty	0	1	2	3
The students	0	1	2	3
Student Affairs staff	0	1	2	3
The governing board of your institution	0	1	2	3
External agencies such as foundations, accrediting agencies, etc	0	1	2	3
Other (please list and rate):_____	0	1	2	3

6. Rate the degree to which the following factors serve as barriers to cooperation between student affairs and academic affairs on your campus. Circle the number that best reflects your opinion.

	Not a Barrier	Minimal Barrier	Moderate Barrier	Strong Barrier
Resource limitations	0	1	2	3
Organizational culture (history and traditions)	0	1	2	3
Organizational structure (reporting lines between units)	0	1	2	3
Personalities of the senior administrators for each area	0	1	2	3
Beliefs of student affairs staff that inhibit a positive relationship	0	1	2	3
Beliefs of academic affairs staff or faculty that inhibit a positive relationship	0	1	2	3
Size of the institution	0	1	2	3
Organizational policies and procedures	0	1	2	3
Reward structures	0	1	2	3
Other (please list and rate):_____	0	1	2	3

From the list above, what are the top two barriers at your institution?

1. _____ 2. _____

INSTITUTION AND ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

7. What was the Fall 2002 headcount enrollment of you institution?

Up to 500 ____
501 to 1000 ____
1001 to 2000 ____
2001 or more ____

8. Is your institution public or private?

Public ____
Private ____

9. Is your institution formally affiliated with a religious denomination?

Yes ____ If yes, which denomination? _____
No ____

10. Does the senior student affairs administrator report to the senior academic affairs administrator at your institution?

Yes ____
No ____

11. At my institution I am currently the:

Senior Academic Affairs Administrator ____
Senior Student Affairs Administrator ____

12. Was your most recent previous higher education position in student affairs or academic affairs?

Student Affairs ____
Academic Affairs ____
Other ____ (Please specify) _____

13. Have you ever held a full time professional position in academics affairs?

Yes ____
No ____

14. How long have you been in your current position at this institution?

Less than a year ____
One to 4 years ____
5 to 10 years ____
More than 10 years ____

15. Please indicate your gender.

Female ____
Male ____

16. Is there anything else you would like to add or suggest regarding the relationship between academic affairs and student affairs?